Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-220
Thursday
16 November 1989

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-220 *16 November 1989*

CONTENTS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Cheney Claims of USSR Modernizing Arms Questioned *[Kozyakov on Moscow International]* 1
'Delay' in New Arms Agreement blamed on U.S *[Bogachev on TASS]* 1
Nazarkin on Strategic Arms Talks, December Summit *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 16 Nov]* 2
U.S. Negotiator on Nuclear Test Talks Progress *[IZVESTIYA 11 Nov]* 2
Akhromeyev Wants Warsaw Pact, NATO Dissolution *[Berlin ADN]* 3
Soviet Negotiator Stresses Naval Arms Cuts *[IZVESTIYA 10 Nov]* 3
Soviet Arms Control Inspectors Arrive in Belgium *[TASS]* 4

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Shevardnadze Interviewed on International Topics 5
Radio Interview *[Moscow International]* 5
TASS Report 6
TASS Reports Gremitskikh 15 Nov Press Briefing 9
No Gorbachev Visit to Berlin 9
Arms Supplies to Salvador Groups 9
Yazov Visit to Austria 9
French Foreign Minister's Visit 9
Elections in Namibia 10
PLO Role in Middle East Settlement 10
Correction to Gremitskikh Press Briefing 14 Nov *[TASS]* 10
Interference in Domestic Affairs Warned Against *[Korionov in PRAVDA 14 Nov]* 10
UN General Assembly Discusses Cambodia Situation *[TASS]* 12

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

TASS Reports Bush Speech on Upcoming Summit 14
U.S. Attitude to Soviet GATT Membership *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA No 45]* 14
Unearthing of Past Soviet Disasters Pondered *[IZVESTIYA 14 Nov]* 15

China

Border, Confidence-Building Discussed With PRC *[Moscow International]* 17
CPC Plenum Approves Deng Xiaoping Retirement *[IZVESTIYA 11 Nov]* 17
Li Peng on Deng Stepdown, West's Sanctions *[IZVESTIYA 14 Nov]* 18
CPSU, Defense Group Congratulate Jiang Zemin *[TASS]* 18
PRAVDA Notes Kim Il-song Visit to PRC *[14 Nov]* 18

Northeast Asia

Yakovlev, Delegation Continue Visit to Japan 18
PRAVDA on 13 Nov Meetings *[14 Nov]* 18
14 Nov Activities Noted *[PRAVDA 15 Nov]* 20
Meets JSP's Doi, Sees Progress on Korea *[Moscow International]* 21
Tells Doi No Rush on Territories *[Tokyo TV]* 21
Meets With Party Leaders *[TASS]* 22
Receives Nakasone, Other Leaders *[TASS]* 22
Visits Diet; Gives Press Conference *[Moscow Radio]* 23
Moscow TV on News Conference 23
KYODO Reports Press Conference *[Tokyo KYODO]* 23

Tokyo TV on Press Conference 25
Yakovlev Urges Economic, Political Ties *[Tokyo KYODO]* 26
Remarks on Europe Troop Withdrawal, Korea *[TASS]* 26
Soviet-Japanese Ties 'Markedly Improved' *[TASS]* 27
More Work Said Required in Japan Ties *[Dmitriyev on Moscow International]* 27

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Rally Against U.S. Bases Held in Manila *[Moscow International]* 28
Aquino's U.S. Trip, Bases Issue Analyzed *[Aleksandrov on Moscow International]* 28
Aquino Trip Praised, U.S. Stand on Bases Hit *[Moscow International]* 29

Near East

Afghan Deputy Minister Briefs Diplomats *[TASS]* 29
U.S. Arms Aid Plans for Afghan Rebels Cited *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 11 Nov]* 30
'Arafat Interview Marks Palestinian Anniversary *[PRAVDA 15 Nov]* 30
Moscow Meeting Marks Nehru Birth Centenary *[PRAVDA 14 Nov]* 31
Gorbachev Writes Foreword to Nehru Anthology *[PRAVDA 13 Nov]* 31

East Europe

Roy Medvedev Views Changes in East Europe *[Rome ANSA]* 32
Poland's Mazowiecki To Visit USSR in November *[TASS]* 33
V.A. Medvedev Meets Visiting PZPR Official *[PRAVDA 11 Nov]* 33
'Extremist' Demonstrations in Poland Hit *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 14 Nov]* 33
Correspondent Views Kohl Visit to Poland *[Moscow International]* 34
Chancellor Kohl Cited on GDR Events *[PRAVDA 12 Nov]* 34
GDR Citizens' Visits to W. Berlin Described *[PRAVDA 16 Nov]* 35
Observer on GDR Developments, SED's Role *[Kondrashov on TASS]* 35
GDR's Krenz on Coming Talks With Kohl *[TASS]* 36
GDR Communists' 10 Nov Rally Reported *[PRAVDA 12 Nov]* 37
PRAVDA Reports SED Personnel Changes 38

West Europe

Gorbachev Greets Turkey's Ozal on Election *[TASS]* 39
Gorbachev Meets Dumas, Notes Changes in Europe *[TASS]* 39
Mitterrand Summit Call, E. Europe Link Noted *[IZVESTIYA 15 Nov]* 40
Potapov Views French Foreign Minister's Visit *[Moscow International]* 40
PCF's Marchais on Need for E. Europe Changes *[PRAVDA 14 Nov]* 40
Italian Assembly Backs Gorbachev for Nobel Prize *[TASS]* 41
PCI Leader on Gorbachev's Coming Italy Visit *[TASS]* 41
Ryzhkov Receives Italian Cooperatives Delegation *[PRAVDA 15 Nov]* 42
Italian Communists To Boycott Romanian Congress *[IZVESTIYA 15 Nov]* 42
Shevardnadze Interviewed on Nordic Issues *[Stockholm DAGENS NYHETER 10 Nov]* 42

Latin America & Caribbean

Spokesman Denies Arms Supplied to El Salvador *[TASS]* 44
Flareup of Fighting in El Salvador Noted *[IZVESTIYA 14 Nov]* 44

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Economic Reform Conference

Official on Economic Reform Conference Agenda *[EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA No 44]* 46
Abalkin Discusses Economic Theory, Practice *[PRAVDA 11 Nov]* 47
Slyunkov Closing Speech at Economic Conference *[PRAVDA 16 Nov]* 51
Abalkin Comments on Results *[TASS]* 55
Interview With Conference Delegate *[Moscow TV]* 55

Supreme Soviet Session

Gorbachev 13 Nov Supreme Soviet Speech *[Moscow TV]* 56
Moscow TV Airs 15 Nov Supreme Soviet Proceedings 57
1615 GMT 57
1641 GMT 58
1746 GMT 58
1818 GMT 59
Supreme Soviet Discusses Nationalities Issues *[TASS]* 59
Abalkin Calls for State Control of Prices, Goods *[Moscow Radio]* 60
Legislation on Local Soviets Viewed *[PRAVDA 13 Nov]* 60
Supreme Soviet Decree on Co-op Activity *[EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA No 44]* 62

Political & Social

Gorbachev 15 Nov Speech at All-Union Student Forum *[PRAVDA 16 Nov]* 64
Gorbachev Meets With Delegates *[Moscow TV]* 75
Exchanges With Students Reported *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 16 Nov]* 75
Mood at Forum Described *[PRAVDA 16 Nov]* 77
Grossu Replaced as Moldavian Party Head *[TASS]* 78
Further on Disturbances in Moldavia 78
Aftermath Reported *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 14 Nov]* 78
First Secretary on Situation *[Moscow TV]* 79
Efforts to Improve Situation Fail *[TASS]* 80
Moldavian Popular Front 29 Oct Meeting Detailed *[SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA 1 Nov]* 80
Vorkuta Mining Situation Updated 81
Five Demands Made *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 15 Nov]* 81
Free Unions Sought *[AFP]* 82
Strike Affecting Smelting *[Moscow TV]* 82
Situation at Working Mine *[PRAVDA 14 Nov]* 82
Further on Situation *[TASS]* 83
Work Collectives Discuss Kuzbass *[TASS]* 83
Miners' Conference Held in Kuznetsk Basin *[TASS]* 84
'Alternative' 7 November Parade Noted *[MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA 8 Nov]* 84
Unsanctioned 7 November Meeting Reported *[MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA 8 Nov]* 84
Fall Draft Sparks Latvian Anti-Army Campaign *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 31 Oct]* 84
Latvian Procuracy Appeals for Call-up Observation *[Riga CIMA 27 Oct]* 86
Lithuanian Communist Party Bureau Summoned *[Vilnius International]* 87
Media Coverage of Vilnius Parade Incident Noted *[Vilnius International]* 87
Belorussian Public Bodies Lose Voting Privilege *[IZVESTIYA 28 Oct]* 88
Belorussian Grodno Obkom Elects First Secretary *[Moscow TV]* 88
Kazakh Supreme Soviet Opposes Semipalatinsk Tests *[Moscow TV]* 88
Kazakh Supreme Soviet Elects New Officials *[Alma-Ata Radio]* 89
Activists Comment on Armenian Movement's Goals *[Yerevan International]* 89
Supreme Soviet Official Visits Stepanakert *[Yerevan International]* 89
Lack of Fuel Cripples Air Transport in Armenia *[ARMENPRESS]* 90
Armenians Killed Trying to Blow Up Monument *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 11 Nov]* 90
Further on Azerbaijan Blockade of Armenia *[Yerevan KOMMUNIST 10 Oct]* 91
Yuriy Afanasyev on Gorbachev Criticism *[Paris LE QUOTIDIEN DE PARIS 9 Nov]* 93
Siberian Gas Pipeline Explodes; No Casualties *[TASS]* 94
40 km Damaged *[Moscow Radio]* 94
Reshaping of CPSU Statutes Discussed *[PRAVDA 12 Nov]* 95

Economic

Basis for Joint Ventures Becoming 'Broader'
[Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE] 99
Development of Energy-Conserving Sources Stressed
[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 28 Oct] 99
Action To Order 'Chaotic' Computer Market Urged *[IZVESTIYA 10 Nov]* 101
Deputy Examines Reasons for Rail Freight Problems *[GUDOK 31 Oct]* 101

Voronin Comments on Existing Supply Problems
[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 8 Nov] 102
Economic Discontent Leads to Mass Meeting in Kiev *[PRAVDA UKRAINY 15 Oct]* 103

Scientific

Space Module To Link with 'Mir' Station 104
26 November Launch *[TASS]* 104
Further Details *[TASS]* 105
U.S. To Launch Satellites With Soviet Rockets *[TASS]* 105
Moscow Radio Advertises Satellite Photos *[Moscow Radio]* 105
New TV Satellite Station Opens in Semipalatinsk *[Alma Ata Radio]* 106

Military

Press Conference Details Sale of Ex-Army Hardware *[PRAVDA 10 Nov]* 106
Gorbachev Signs Decree for Military Promotions *[TASS]* 107

Cheney Claims of USSR Modernizing Arms Questioned

LD1511140189 Moscow in English to North America 0001 GMT 15 Nov 89

[Text] Defense Secretary Cheney said last Sunday the Soviet Union is modernizing strategic arms and will definitely have very modern strategic forces in the foreseeable future, as he put it. Here's a commentary written by Vladislav Kozyakov:

This was said in reply to a WASHINGTON POST report on the same day that the Soviet Union had stopped producing four weapons, the SS-18, SS-24 missiles, the Blackjack bomber, and typhoon submarine, and had also suspended work on an aircraft carrier. The paper said the report was apparently based on satellite photography.

Secretary Cheney did not flatly deny the report. On Meet the Press on television, he said the Soviets had probably retarded the deployment of some of their new systems not to exceed the ceiling suggested for a strategic arms halving treaty. But the defense secretary added at once to maintain the American (?hardware), that by the late nineties even if the treaty is signed the Soviets will have changed out, completely replaced, and modernized every single leg of the Triad.

I wouldn't like to believe the Pentagon leaders are bullying Americans again. They used to do this to make Congress back the Triad with more billions. And this spending has jumped 2 and ½ times over the last 10 years from 15 billion to 38 billion.

If the U.S. military budget for fiscal 1990 wins approval in the Senate, new weapons of the entire Triad will be financed: The MX and Midgetman ballistic missiles, Trident-2 missiles for submarines, and B-2 Stealth bombers, which the Soviet Union is not going to produce incidently.

As we can see, the production of strategic systems that were masterminded when Soviet-American relations were edgy is in full swing. But perestroyka has created a situation that is opportune for ending the race in strategic weapons. It is opportune, not only to cut by half the Soviet and American weapons of this kind under the agreement to be signed at the summit next year. By the late 1990s that Cheney spoke of, our two countries could also get rid of all other nuclear weapons—the Soviet Union is ready for this.

In a conversation with Secretary of State Baker early this year, Mikhail Gorbachev spoke of strategic arms reductions. He wanted to see solutions that would not damage each other's trust or provoke the suspicion that somebody wants to place another to a disadvantage and he pointed out that this country supports its stand with actions.

'Delay' in New Arms Agreement blamed on U.S

LD1511174989 Moscow TASS in English 1615 GMT 15 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 15 TASS—By TASS Military Analyst Vladimir Bogachev:

The Soviet and American delegations began negotiations on strategic armaments limitation in Helsinki on November 16, 1969, exactly twenty years ago.

These negotiations, lasting for two decades now, have reflected the ups and downs of relations between the two countries—the name of the talks has changed, as well as the range of armaments they now cover. The sides have also reconsidered their attitudes to earlier agreed decisions.

Important agreements were concluded at the first stage of the negotiations—the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems Treaty (1972), which is still important for the stability of the world military and political situation, the interim agreement with respect to the Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms (1972), which set limits for the deployment by both sides of intercontinental ballistic missiles and of missiles fired from submarines, and the Agreement on the Prevention of Nuclear War (1973).

The drafting of new strategic arms agreements slowed down noticeably at subsequent stages. While it took 2.5 years to prepare the ABM treaty and the interim agreement, almost seven years were needed to sign the SALT-2 treaty.

The current talks on nuclear and space armaments, covering strategic offensive systems, started in March 1985 and are continuing to this day. This is explained not only by the fact that the list of weaponry, subject for reduction, has grown, but by the desire of both sides to have more dependable verification systems, and by the development of new weapon systems.

It appears that the delay in drafting a new agreement on strategic offensive weapons was caused primarily by the fact that Washington is eager to cut strategic weapons that give military superiority to the Soviet Union, but bluntly refuses to discuss any limitation of systems that give the United States military advantages. This is precisely why the Americans refuse to solve the problem of sea-based cruise missiles and are dragging out the talks on air-based missiles of this type.

One of the main obstacles to an agreement on strategic offensive arms is the desire of certain U.S. circles to undermine the Soviet- American ABM agreement by means of the SDI programme. Its true purpose is to draw the Soviet Union into an expensive space arms race and thereby complicate the realisation of Soviet economic plans.

Such a policy is incompatible with the principle of equal security which is an obligatory precondition for any agreement on arms verification.

Nazarkin on Strategic Arms Talks, December Summit

PM1511220789 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 16 Nov 89 First Edition p 3

[Text] Geneva, 14 Nov—The 20th anniversary of the start of Soviet-U.S. strategic arms talks falls on 16 November. All these years, the talks have been at the center of attention not just in the USSR and the United States, but all over the world. And opinions have differed as regards their fruitfulness.

A TASS correspondent asked Yu. Nazarkin, head of the Soviet delegation at the talks, to appraise the importance and results of this dialogue.

Answer: In order to more correctly appraise the results, it is necessary to recall the political conditions prevailing during these 20 years. They kept changing. The talks started during the era of detente, and their very first stage was crowned with a major success—the conclusion of the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems, which remains highly important to this day, the Interim Agreement on Certain Measures With Respect to the Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms, which laid down certain quantitative limitations on these arms, and the Agreement on Preventing Nuclear War.

Question: What is happening now at the talks on nuclear and space arms?

Answer: Work is being done to elaborate a treaty on reducing both sides' strategic offensive arms by approximately one-half. At the same time, accompanying documents which will be appended to the treaty are also being elaborated. This is a very large and complex package of documents which will have to enshrine not only an accord on fundamental political questions but also thoroughly worked-established procedures to ensure effective performance of the treaty and to rule out any likelihood of a situation whereby the sides might give different interpretations to its various provisions. For this purpose it is necessary to formulate them in precise legal language and to take a mass of military-technical details into account. This is what our main work involves.

Of course, work is also being done to overcome the remaining unsolved major problems. I would mention first and foremost the problem of long-range air-and sea-launched cruise missiles.

Question: As a direct participant in this work, what would you say about the atmosphere in which it is being done now?

Answer: Such complex talks would, of course, be impossible to imagine without businesslike collaborative relations, and this in turn demands mutual respect and trust. These are the relations which we have developed with the U.S. delegation.

Question: The Soviet-U.S. summit meeting scheduled for early December will differ, to a certain extent, from such meetings in the past. It will be an interim, unofficial meeting. Do you expect it to influence the course of the Geneva talks?

Answer: Any meeting between the leaders of the USSR and the United States is such a major event that, whatever its nature, it inevitably has an effect on the development of the international situation. The forthcoming meeting will be no exception. I am confident that it will help to develop and deepen the positive trends which have developed in Soviet-U.S. relations in the last few years and which have such a favorable influence on the general thaw in the political climate. I think that this also applies in full to the talks on nuclear and space arms.

U.S. Negotiator on Nuclear Test Talks Progress

PM1411100189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "P. Robinson on Nuclear Tests"]

[Text] Washington, 10 Nov—Very great progress has been made in the past year at the full-scale Soviet-U.S. talks on limiting and ultimately halting nuclear tests in Geneva, progress which gives hope that they will be completed before the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in late spring-early summer next year. This was stated on Thursday by Paul Robinson, leader of the U.S. delegation at these talks.

"At the Wyoming meeting Secretary of State James Baker and Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze resolved a number of major outstanding questions, which created the basis for completing work on the protocols of treaties," Robinson told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Hearings were being held there on the Bush administration's stance on nuclear weapons tests. According to Robinson, the USSR and the United States have been able to reach agreement on new monitoring mechanisms that meet the requirements of the talk participants. "Moreover, we have agreed provisions which will make it possible for each side to enhance its national technical means of monitoring," he said. "I consider that the elaboration of such a package of monitoring measures is a sensible approach.... We are currently drafting in Geneva the text of a protocol to put these mechanisms into effect. I think that there is every reason to think that we will be able to complete the work by the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting."

At the same time the U.S. Administration's reluctance to go beyond partial limitations on nuclear explosions and seek a general and complete ban on nuclear tests was reaffirmed at the hearings.

Akhromeyev Wants Warsaw Pact, NATO Dissolution

LD1611103589 East Berlin ADN in English 0907 GMT 16 Nov 89

[Text] Bonn (ADN)—Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev's top military adviser, Marshal Sergey Akhromeyev, was quoted on Wednesday as saying Moscow was ready for the Warsaw Pact and NATO military alliances to be dissolved.

"We are not glued to the idea that the alliances must last forever," Akhromeyev said in an interview with the FRG weekly magazine STERN.

"The Soviet Union is prepared for both military alliances to be abolished," the marshal was quoted as saying.

The Warsaw Pact had contributed most towards reducing military tension and was waiting for NATO to make concrete steps towards disarmament.

He asked why theatre nuclear weapons were still excluded from reduction while agreement was making headway on conventional disarmament. The United States and NATO were not prepared to discuss a reduction of naval forces, Akhromeyev was quoted as saying.

Soviet Negotiator Stresses Naval Arms Cuts

PM1311111589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 1

[Own correspondent S. Tosunyan dispatch under the "Abroad" rubric: "Vienna: Fourth Round Tasks"]

[Text] Vienna—After a 3-day recess the next, fourth, round of talks on conventional armed forces in Europe has begun in Vienna's Hofburg Palace. As is well known, 23 NATO and Warsaw Pact countries are taking part in them. A day later participants in the talks on confidence- and security-building measures representing 33 European countries, along with the United States and Canada, will get down to work in the same Hofburg Palace.

The leaders of a number of delegations spoke to journalists, setting out their views on the tasks ahead. Ambassador at Large O.A. Grinevskiy, head of the Soviet delegation, recalled the fundamental proposals put forward by the Warsaw Pact states on aviation, verification, exchange of information, and stabilizing measures. They are designed to help secure accords in the main key areas. The outcome of the upcoming round and the talks as a whole will in many respects depend on the answers the NATO countries give to our proposals, he said. From this viewpoint the fourth round may be crucial.

In the next 6-8 weeks we have to study the most complex unresolved problems. They include aviation, numbers of personnel, regional division, and arms stockpiles.

At the same time work will continue on editing the texts and agreeing definitions. It proved possible in October to agree on a document defining artillery. Before the end of the year definitions have to be prepared on at least three categories of arms: tanks, combat armored vehicles, and helicopters. If it proves possible to formulate a definition on aviation, that would be a pleasant surprise in time for the Christmas festivities.

"We are proposing," the Soviet diplomat went on to say, "to begin agreeing documents on exchange of information and on verification. This is the foundation of a future agreement. We also have to elaborate a document on stabilizing measures. The essence of this document is to provide additional security guarantees on the untrodden path of European disarmament. Lastly, we have to embark on agreeing on the text of the treaty itself. Those are the concrete tasks which must, in the opinion of the Soviet delegation, be resolved at the coming round of talks."

It is hard to proceed with significant reductions in conventional arms, O.A. Grinevskiy went on to say, if there is no confidence that there will be countermovement toward naval arms limitations and reductions. The situation in this sphere is now as follows: NATO is superior to the Warsaw Pact by a factor of 4.5 in terms of the numerical strengthen of naval personnel, by a factor of 7.6 in terms of numbers of ocean-going ships, by a factor of 2 in terms of total tonnage, and by a factor of 2.5 in terms of naval warplanes.

The situation is further complicated by the fact that the West is now avoiding talks on sea-based weapons. What conclusion can be drawn from this? Only one, namely that NATO countries want to retain their free hand.

Naval arms are very costly and competition here is ruinous for everyone. Moreover, by virtue of its geographical position, the Soviet Union cannot use naval forces to the same extent as the United States. U.S. ships can approach the shores of the Soviet Union and its allied states to within effective striking range of their deck-borne aviation and long-range nuclear cruise missiles, in which NATO has a considerable edge.

One may ask: Is there a hope in these conditions of securing an agreement on European conventional forces? Yes, without doubt, there is, the Soviet diplomat stressed. We want such an accord. But we need to be confident that we are not being drawn into a naval arms race. That is why the task of initiating talks on limiting and reducing sea-based arms is particularly acute today. Here, in Vienna, we must at the very least strive to extend confidence-building measures, including the exchange of information, to naval forces.

Soviet Arms Control Inspectors Arrive In Belgium

LD1611054589 Moscow TASS in English 2052 GMT 15 Nov 89

[Text] Brussels November 15 TASS—A group of Soviet inspectors arrived in Belgium today in line with the accords on control over compliance with the Soviet-American agreement on the elimination of medium and shorter-range missiles.

The last American cruise missiles, deployed at the military base in the area of Florennes, were taken to the United States to be destroyed last December. That was verified by Soviet inspectors in spring.

According to a statement by the Belgian Defence Ministry, a number of missiles without warheads remain only in the European missile repair and maintenance centre in Gausly, near Charleroi. According to the terms of the agreement, it will function until the completion of the withdrawal of the American missiles from Europe.

Shevardnadze Interviewed on International Topics

Radio Interview

LD1511231489 Moscow World Service in English 2210 GMT 15 Nov 89

["Exclusive interview" with USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze by Aleksandr Plevako, head of Radio Moscow's External Service; date and place not given; recorded—Shevardnadze and Plevako speak in Russian fading into English translation]

[Text] [Plevako] The first question to Eduard Shevardnadze was could you explain the mechanism of how foreign policy decision making in the Soviet leadership works?

[Shevardnadze] I touched upon this in my speech in the USSR Supreme Soviet. As far as the most important large-scale political actions are concerned there is a well-oiled mechanism for formulating the Soviet Union's position. Take disarmament problems. The Soviet Union's attitude to them is discussed and formulated by representatives of the Communist Party leadership, the government, the military agencies, defense industries, major research establishments, and of course, the Foreign Ministry. One may ask who takes the initiative? Different situations arise. Many foreign policy initiatives come from our diplomats, who naturally sense the world situation more keenly, and from the Foreign Ministry. Our colleagues, too, make proposals. Then, after collective discussions have produced a definite decision, thorough and persistent work begins to carry it out. I must say that the most important, the major proposals, are connected with Mikhail Gorbachev's work, with his initiatives. For instance the idea of banishing nuclear arms by the end of this century, or the concept of a common European home, or the proposals he made in Vladivostok, Krasnoyarsk, Murmansk, in the European Parliament, and in the United Nations. The innovative activities in Soviet foreign policy by the whole of our society and the new political thinking have indeed brought about major changes in the world.

[Plevako] How do the leaders of other countries see our perestroyka? Is their vision of this country changing?

[Shevardnadze] I have the impression that most of the world's political leaders have confidence in the sincerity of our intentions and the principles proclaimed by the congress of the Communist Party, the national party conference, the congress of People's Deputies, and the Supreme Soviet. The fundamental principles of new thinking have become an asset of the entire world community. The re-fashioned foreign policy of the Soviet Union is having a tremendous effect on world developments.

[Plevako] In your speech in Parliament you said that no political decisions should run counter to morality, you also said you reserved the right to resign if you found that a decision you had been asked to accept was immoral.

[Shevardnadze] I am sincerely convinced that the principles of new political thinking which the Soviet leadership has been able to formulate since April 1985 fully meet all moral and ethical requirements. If I were not certain about that I would have done what I said about resigning.

[Plevako] How does the Soviet leadership see the current changes in the European socialist countries and the attempts in the West to interpret the events in Poland, Hungary, and the German Democratic republic as a collapse of socialism?

[Shevardnadze] I see nothing out of the ordinary in these processes. What has been going on in Eastern Europe, in the countries of our allies, is quite logical. They have left the commitments they have as our allies intact. This has been stated repeatedly by the leaders of these countries. A process of renewal is under way. A new image of socialist society is taking shape. In differing countries this is proceeding differently, which is also logical. So are the processes that are now causing a stormy reaction in the world I mean the events in the German Democratic Republic. The decisions taken by the Republic's new leadership, especially to open the borders to its citizens to travel abroad and back, are consonant with the Helsinki Accords. This is a manifestation of the new civilized relations that have been taking shape between the European countries and between East and West. So you see that everything that's now happening in the East European countries is part of efforts to put up a common European home. Democratization is central to these changes, and this is true of the Soviet Union, too. Only a Europe built on profoundly democratic principles can become our common home.

[Plevako] The problem of Afghanistan has remained a bleeding wound to us. Will there be peace restored in that country in the near future?

[Shevardnadze] I have no doubt whatsoever that we will see a peaceful Afghanistan. When? Forecasting is a risky business. The situation there is serious and difficult. The Afghan people are faced with intervention. Apparently we must seek a solution by internationalizing efforts to solve the Afghan problem. Certain favorable shifts have already taken place. As for the situation inside Afghanistan, the patriotic forces there have been uniting on a platform of national reconciliation.

[Plevako] Some Radio Moscow listeners voiced the opinion that disarmament and the normalization of Soviet-American relations are proceeding too slowly. What is your opinion on this score? To what extent can the forthcoming Soviet-American summit in early December give a positive impetus to this process?

[Shevardnadze] I wouldn't say that the disarmament process has been proceeding slowly. If we look back at

what has happened since 1985, we see a very impressive picture. What we should be talking about is something different. The most serious problem is that the rate of the arms race outstrips the disarmament process. For that reason the forthcoming meeting, which has been in the news so much, is very important. Although it has been announced that it is going to be a routine meeting, I do not rule out the possibility that some major agreement will be reached there. No detailed agenda has been drawn up or particular preparatory work done. Yet any meeting of the leaders of the great powers is likely to bring about serious intellectual breakthroughs. That happened at Reykyavik. There have been other such cases, too. So I believe the meeting will be very important in many respects, including progress in disarmament.

[Plevako] This is your first interview for Radio Moscow's External Service, which turned 60 recently. We have an estimated audience of 100 million people around the world. What would you like to tell them?

[Announcer] I think you have an audience larger than 100 million and we hope so, too, the interviewer remarked. What is most important of all for every family, Eduard Shevardnadze said addressing our listeners, is a peaceful sky (?and that humanity, civilization) be safe from a nuclear or ecological disaster. The most complicated economic and social problems must be solved. I don't know whether there is anybody in the world indifferent to these problems. I wish all Radio Moscow listeners peace, happiness and prosperity.

TASS Report

LD1611091189 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2145 GMT 15 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow, Nov 16 (TASS)—Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, gave the following interview to the Soviet external service—Moscow Radio—today.

Question: You have been the head of our Foreign Policy Department for just over 4 years, but during this time, you have become an authoritative figure in the international arena and you enjoy great trust among the Soviet people. Could you raise the veil a bit over the mechanism of working out and adopting the important foreign policy decisions of the Politburo and the Supreme Soviet? What place does your word occupy?

Answer: I touched upon this problem in my speech in the Supreme Soviet. As far as the most important and most large-scale political actions for formulating the position of the Soviet leadership and the Soviet Union are concerned, there is a well-oiled mechanism. I spoke about that fact that the representatives of the leadership of the party, the government of the country, military departments, when the matter concerns disarmament problems, representatives of the military industry and big science and, naturally, of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs jointly discuss and formulate the position of our country and our state.

The question may arise—from where does the initiative come and who is displaying the initiative? Different situations can arise here. Many questions, and I can say without false modesty that many initiatives concerning the foreign policy activity of our state and of our country, have come from diplomats. This is quite natural because diplomats perhaps feel more acutely than others the atmosphere in the world, the moods of people, and the state of world public opinion. This applies to our ambassadors, and our other representatives who work beyond the bounds of the country. And we sense this directly at talks, at bilateral and multilateral talks.

In connection with this, and in connection with this objective, so to speak, situation, very often many questions, which subsequently become a subject of discussion of that collective body, of collective bodies, emanate from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

I should say that other colleagues of ours and partners in our common work also display the same initiative.

Then, after the formulation of a position, great painstaking, insistent, and dogged work begins in order to realise it.

But there is something else I should also say. With regard to the most important and most major proposals, they undoubtedly are connected with the activity of Comrade Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, and with his initiatives. I can even recall them now. The Soviet proposals about the elimination of nuclear weapons by the year 2000; the idea of the construction of an all-European home; the proposals advanced in Vladivostok and Krasnoyarsk, Murmansk, at the European Parliament, at the United Nations—all this is connected with his name and with his, so to speak, initiatives in the supreme post of the Soviet state.

But I shall not say that we all stand aside; we participate in this process, which is very complex and very responsible. I must say that recently, thanks to the innovative activity in the field of foreign policy, of the whole of our society, and thanks to the new political thinking, much has indeed changed in the world.

Question: In connection with this, if you will permit a question which I would very much like to ask you. You meet many political figures from foreign countries. To what extent do they, the "top people" in those countries, grasp the new thinking about which you have spoken, and to what extent is their image of our country changing? Do they truly approve of the process of perestroyka, and do they believe in our love of peace?

Answer: I have the impression that the majority of the world's political figures believe in the sincerity of our intentions and of the principles that have been proclaimed from the rostrum of the party congress and

conference, at the Congress of People's Deputies and in the Supreme Soviet.—that is very important. [punctuation as received]—You know, I would even like to put that more precisely. When some elements in our actions prompt a pained reaction from our partners, especially in the West, they tell us, "that does not correspond to the principles of the new thinking." In other words, the principles of the new thinking have themselves truly become the possession of the whole world community and, naturally, of all political figures. They are bound to reflect a varying understanding and varying approaches. But it is an actual fact that the new policy, the renewed foreign policy of the Soviet Union and the principles of the new political thinking, are undoubtedly having a very great influence on world events.

Question: That is, of course, an enormous achievement, and it is very nice that you have spoken of it. When you spoke at the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, you stressed that any political decision and any diplomatic action must be moral, above all. Otherwise, even if they seem pragmatically beneficial, they cannot be justified, and you cited as an example the decision to send Soviet troops to Afghanistan.

You also said that you retain the right to resign if you consider that a decision imposed on you is an immoral one.

Eduard Amvrosiyevich, would you tell us please whether you consider that this is, in general, possible and is it possible in principle in politics to be guided solely by moral principles?

Answer: You know, I deeply believe and am sincerely convinced that all the principles of the new political thinking which the Soviet leadership has managed to formulate since April 1985 are in full accord with the basic requirements of ethics and morality. If I had not been convinced of this, I would have already carried out what I said regarding resignation. Therefore I am deeply convinced. Understood. I do not understand any other policy—any policy that would run counter to.... Probably it would not have been so successful, incidentally, would it? No, and the peoples would not have accepted it. They would not have accepted it. They will not accept it.

Question: A big question, but I would ask you to give a short answer to it. Afghanistan remains for all of us a large, bleeding wound. What do you think, will we see peace restored in this country in the near future?

Answer: That we will see a peaceful Afghanistan I have no doubt. But when this will happen, this is a very complicated question. Forecasts about this, to make any forecasts, is a risky business. Since the situation is, in essence, complicated, very difficult, intervention against the Afghan people, against Afghanistan is being carried out. Very great efforts and not only on the part of the Afghan leadership, but also on the part of the Soviet Union, India, other states, and the whole world community, are needed.

Question: But in principle, is the matter nevertheless moving towards a solution? Can one say that the tendency is such?

Answer: There are positive elements. As far as the situation inside the country is concerned, there the platform of national reconciliation is really working.

The consolidation of the patriotic forces of Afghanistan around the president is also proceeding. This is a very important event, an important phenomenon. It seems to me that the Afghans understand now that they themselves have to resolve the destiny of their country, and have to resolve it on the basis of national reconciliation, national unity, and the uniting of all the healthy patriotic forces of the country.

Question: We are often accused abroad that by rendering material military assistance to peoples who are defending their independence, we are interfering in the natural process of formation of states and that in doing this, we are violating the principles of ethics, undermining international stability, and so on. What could you say briefly about this?

Answer: This question has many aspects. You see, there exist obligations between states. This does not contradict international law. These agreements and these treaties are drawn up and then they are implemented.

If these obligations are undertaken within the boundaries, within the framework of international law, and if they are implemented,—I do not see anything immoral in it.

We have these obligations towards many states and many countries of the world and they are being implemented in an inappropriate manner.

Incidentally, the Soviet Union is not an exception. Weapons are supplied by other states and by other countries, too.

It is bad when arms are supplied to the forces which are trying to destabilize the situation in the country.

Question: To cause it to explode?

Answer: To cause the situation to explode. That is another matter. These are truly immoral actions that are not in keeping with the principles of morality in politics. We have been condemning this kind of practice and we shall continue to do so.

But generally we advocate in principle gradually reducing, on a reciprocal basis, military supplies, supplies of arms to various regions and various countries, and making this process controllable and monitorable in the end. We are even proposing to set up a register of this kind in the United Nations so that the world community will know which country supplies what kind of weapons to particular regions and on what scale. The fewer weapons there are, the more security there is.

Question: Eduard Amvrosiyevich, a very complex, unstraightforward, but very important process of renewal is happening now in our country and in other countries. Some people would interpret the changes in Poland and Hungary as the collapse of socialism. What could you say about this, and how does the Soviet leadership regard the current transformations in socialist countries? This is a big question, of course, but if one formulates it as shortly as possible, what could you say about this?

Answer: I see nothing unusual in those processes. All that is happening in Eastern Europe, in the Eastern European countries, in the countries of our allies—and alliance obligations remain in force, and the leaders of those countries have said this on several occasions—all that is natural. A process of renewal of society is under way, and a process of emergence of a new image, of formation of a new image of socialist society is under way. True, these processes are taking place and flowing in different countries in different ways. This also is natural, taking account of the specifics and taking account of the mood and desire of people. But I stress that this process is natural.

Including those processes that currently evoke a very stormy reaction in the world. I mean those in the German Democratic Republic.

I think that the decisions which were adopted by the new leadership about opening the borders so that people had free access both to West Berlin and to meet with their relatives in the region, to reunite families and so on, constitute an absolutely natural process. All this corresponds to the Helsinki Act, and to the accords, and all this is a reflection of the new civilized relations that are forming among European states. If you like, between East and West, as one is accustomed to say.

Question: Then, to continue your thought, can one say that these processes promote the solution of the question of the construction of the common European home?

Answer: No doubt about it. I think that everything that is happening in the countries of Eastern Europe now is a component part, a component part of the new home that we are building, the foundations of which we are laying with common efforts. These processes have great prospects in this regard, too.

The common European home cannot correspond to the interests of all the peoples or be convenient for each people and each person without the processes of democratization. I would describe everything that is going on in the Eastern European countries, as it is here in the Soviet Union, as a process where the main characteristic feature is, specifically, the process of democratization.

Only a democratic Europe can become our common home—a Europe which is built on principles of deep democracy, genuine democracy. That is what we are striving for.

Question: I see. Among the 200,000 letters that we receive from 160 countries and territories of the world, there are now many in which listeners are concerned about the Soviet-American dialogue and, in particular, express the view that disarmament is moving too slowly and that the process of the normalization of Soviet-American relations has itself been held back somewhat. Can that be said? Are our listeners correct, and to what degree, in your view, can the meeting that is coming up at the beginning of December provide an impetus in this matter, taking account of the good words being uttered now by representatives of the American side as well?

Answer: You know, I would not say that the disarmament process is proceeding very slowly. The disarmament process is moving. If we analyze everything that has happened since 1985, then, of course, it is a very inspiring picture. We should probably be dealing with something else. All the same, if one compares the process of disarmament, the disarmament process and the rate of the arms race, then all the same, it is the arms race, the rate of the arms race which is outstripping the disarmament process.

That is, so to speak, the most serious problem. Therefore, the summit meeting, about which much is now being spoken, is of very great importance. Seemingly, it is a commonplace meeting, as the president and the general secretary have said—and I, too, have had occasion to speak about it—a working meeting without any particular ambition; seemingly, we should not expect any major breakthroughs. But, you know, I would like to say something else: That I do not rule out the possibility that some kind of major accords will be reached at that meeting. In spite of the fact that there is no precise agenda and it seems that we have not done any special preparatory work, it very often happens in history that when major leaders of great powers meet, very serious intellecutal breakthroughs appear even at such meetings.

So, I believe that this meeting will be of very great importance, including from the point of view of advancing the process of disarmament.

Question: Esteemed comrade minister, this is the first time that you have given an interview to the Soviet external service, Radio Moscow, which recently had its 60th birthday. We have around 100 million listeners throughout the world. What would you like to say to them in connection with your first interview; what would you like to wish them?

Answer: I still think that you have more than 100 million listeners.

Question: We, too, are hoping that. (laughter)

Answer: The main thing, probably, for every family is a peaceful sky, saving of civilization, saving humankind from nuclear and ecological disaster, and these are real dangers. It is the solution of very difficult economic and social problems. I do not know if there is a person on earth whom these problems would not worry and alarm.

I wish every listener of Moscow Radio (if one talks bureaucratic language, I am speaking to your contingent) a peaceful sky, human happiness and prosperity.

Correspondent: Thank you very much on behalf of our listeners for your sincere, full, and most interesting interview. Allow me to express the hope that it will not be the last one for our listeners. Thank you.

TASS Reports Gremitskikh 15 Nov Press Briefing

No Gorbachev Visit to Berlin

LD1511155289 Moscow TASS in English 1541 GMT 15 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 15 TASS—A Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman has described Western reports that Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev intends to visit Berlin to participate in the demolition of the Berlin Wall, as "fiction."

Yuriy Gremitskikh said at a news briefing today that the Soviet stand on the borders of both German states and on the status of West Berlin "has undergone no changes."

Arms Supplies to Salvador Groups

LD1511163289 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1514 GMT 15 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow, 15 Nov—Reports coming in from El Salvador are giving rise to deep alarm in the Soviet Union, a USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman has stated. Commenting on the latest events in this Central American state at the request of a TASS correspondent, he said that the large-scale combat operations using aviation have turned a long civil war into a cruel slaughter in which there can be no winner, since its victims are primarily civilians.

The Soviet Union, moved by principles of humanism common to all mankind, calls on the warring sides in El Salvador to show good will, the USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman stressed. In order to achieve a political settlement to the conflict, it is essential to place the interests of preserving human life higher than any political motives and calculations, to stop the military operations, and again sit at the negotiating table, continuing the dialogue begun by the meetings in Mexico City and San Jose. This USSR position, the Soviet diplomat said, has been brought to the attention of the government of El Salvador and the leadership of the Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front.

The anxiety with regard to the exacerbated situation in El Salvador which has also been expressed in public statements by U.S. officials is quite understandable, the representative of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs noted. In this context, however, responsibility for not setting the critical situation in that country is placed on the Soviet Union, which is supposedly supplying weapons to the Salvadoran insurgent formations. In this connection it is necessary to stress that the Soviet Union has never supplied and is not supplying weapons to the Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front or to any other insurgent movements of Central America. Moreover, the representative of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs stated, the USSR is striving to contribute toward a settlement in the region, and has not been sending weapons to the Nicaraguan Government, with which it is friendly, and is thus not supplying any weapons at all to Central America.

Yazov Visit to Austria

LD1511163789 Moscow TASS in English 1611 GMT 15 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 16 TASS—Soviet Defence Minister Dmitriy Yazov will pay an official visit to the Austrian Republic in the second half of November.

This was announced today at a briefing by Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Yuriy Gremitskykh.

The visit will be paid within the framework of traditional links between the armed forces of the Soviet Union and Austria.

Contacts along military lines between the two countries are intended to further develop and deepen the Soviet-Austrian political dialogue and promote deeper understanding in bilateral relations, Gremitskykh stressed.

French Foreign Minister's Visit

LD1511171689 Moscow TASS in English 1639 GMT 15 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 15 TASS—The talks of French Foreign Minister Roland Dumas with Soviet officials during his official visit to this country were held in an atmosphere of frankness, a Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman said at a news briefing today.

Yuriy Gremitskikh said the visit was the first Soviet-French contact at such a level when negotiations were held not only between ministers but also in working groups on specific issues. This, he added, can help conclude new agreements and concretise existing ones.

At the conclusion of his visit, Dumas met Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev, Gremitskikh went on. During the meeting, the sides spoke highly of Soviet-French cooperation and reiterated the high degree of accord on many issues, reached by Gorbachev and French President Francois Mitterrand in Paris in the summer.

"Gorbachev considered developments in Europe and the rest of the world in their global dynamics," the spokesman said. "The Soviet President emphasised that the changes in East European countries and in the Soviet Union have a common trend favouring the construction of a 'common European home'."

Gremitskikh described the Moscow talks as a "vivid manifestation of the straight manner of raising issues, which is characteristic of Soviet-French relations."

Elections in Namibia

LD1511172289 Moscow TASS in English 1648 GMT 15 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 15 TASS—The Soviet Union is satisfied with the decolonisation process in Namibia, Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Yuriy Gremitskykh told a news briefing today.

The results of elections in that country, he continued, testify to the high prestige of the South West Africa People's Organisation (SWAPO), which received 57.43 per cent of the vote.

Namibia will still have to go through a complex and vital period on its way to establishing its own statehood, to the full completion of decolonisation. Efforts by all parties to the settlement and "front-line" states to create a favourable political climate around the great events in Namibia and promote U.N. efforts toward the decolonisation of that country will have major importance, the soviet spokesman said.

PLO Role in Middle East Settlement

LD1511185789 Moscow TASS in English 1834 GMT 15 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 15 TASS—The Soviet Union welcomes efforts by the Palestine Liberation Organisation to achieve a political settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict on the basis of the recognition of the right to exist of all states of the region and U.N. Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338.

This was stated by Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Yuriy Gremitskikh today.

The Soviet spokesman was speaking on the first anniversary of the Palestinian National Council's decision to declare independence.

The Soviet side, Gremitskikh pointed out, views these decisions as a turn towards new political thinking in the Middle East. They were made in conditions when the continuing Palestinian uprising on the occupied territories began to expand, when international relations began to show changes for the better and a tendency to look for compromise solutions on the basis of a balance of interests instead of attempts at forced settlements.

The past year has confirmed that the decisions of the Palestinian national Council are a major contribution to the process of a fair political settlement in the Middle East.

They have imparted a powerful impulse to the peace efforts, upgraded contacts between the concerned parties and resulted in the beginning of an official dialogue between the United States and the Palestine Liberation Organisation.

The question of the beginning of a Palestinian-Israeli dialogue has been put on a practical footing as a step along the way towards a comprehensive settlement and a convocation of an international conference.

The PLO is ready for such a dialogue. It is up to Israel to show readiness. For its part, the Soviet Union intends to cooperate with other concerned parties to facilitate the creation of a mutually acceptable formula for the Palestinian-Israeli meeting.

One thing is clear to the Soviet Union—without the Palestine Liberation Organisation, no comprehensive fair settlement in the Middle East is possible, the spokesman said.

Palestine Liberation Organisation reprsentatives must participate in the peace process at every phase, the Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman stressed.

Correction to Gremitskikh Press Briefing 14 Nov

LD1511192889

Moscow Tass in English at 1822 GMT on 15 November transmits a corrected version of referent item entitled "Swedish Stance on Baltics" published on page 6 of the 15 November DAILY REPORT:

Page 6, column one, paragraph one, only sentence, the corrected TASS Version reads///The Soviet Union welcomes the fact that Sweden recognises the Baltic republics as part of the USSR, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Yuriy Gremitskikh told a briefing today.

Gremitskikh was commenting///(rewording sentence, picking up paragraph two, sentence one.)

Interference in Domestic Affairs Warned Against

PM1411110989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Nov 89 First Edition p 4

[Vitaliy Korionov "Political Observer's Remarks": "Moving Toward Each Other"]

[Text] The news of the forthcoming meeting between M.S. Gorbachev and G. Bush not only generated the keenest of interest all over the world but also, and even more forcefully, brought the most topical questions of world politics into the center of the broad international debate which is characteristic of the present.

This unexpected news gave rise to a whole series of suppositions by the U.S. press as to why an administration which for quite some time had adopted a wait-and-see attitude toward talks with USSR has embarked on this step. Reference is made to reasons associated with the domestic political situation in the United States itself—for example, the Republicans' need to consolidate their party's positions before the midterm elections

in 1992 [as published]—and to certain differences in the administration between so-called pragmatic skeptics and hard-line skeptics in emphasizing different aspects of foreign policy. But let us not get bogged down in examining such issues. The main interest lies in another, much more important aspect of the issue, that concerning Washington's stance on burning questions of the present.

The meeting between the two great powers' leaders will take place at an extremely crucial time. International relations are at a crossroads. Just over 10 years remain until the start of a new millennium. The Soviet Union has offered mankind a real opportunity to enter it without nuclear fetters. The first practical step has been taken: As a result of the implementation of the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles, the planet has started off-loading nuclear weapons and has already kissed two classes of these weapons goodbye.

The negotiation process, embracing a broad range of questions from the USSR-U.S. talks on a 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive arms to the talks between 23 Warsaw Pact and NATO countries on reducing arms and armed forces in Europe, is steadily gathering pace. The practice of international relations has been enriched by an unprecedented phenomenon: Contacts between representatives of the USSR and U.S. Armed Forces are becoming customary. The flames of regional conflicts are gradually dying down. The idea of building a common European home is gaining more and more supporters.

Interstate contacts are gradually moving out of the zone of confrontation and taking the path of mutual understanding and collaboration. This turnabout is not a gift from heaven. It is the result of the most intensive efforts by all peace-loving forces. There is, however, increasingly frequent admission that the turnabout which is taking place is to a considerable extent a result of Soviet perestroyka and the offspring of the new political thinking. Many analysts in the West are concluding that the world today is living through a period of history whose importance is equal to that of the October 1917 revolution. To take the utmost advantage of the favorable opportunities presenting themselves to mankind—this is the demand that can now be heard ever more loudly everywhere.

Billions of eyes will be watching events in the Mediterranean in December, tensely waiting to find out what signals will be exchanged by the ships on board which the two leaders will hold their unofficial meetings.

One of the questions on which public opinion is focusing today is the West's attitude toward the processes now unfolding in the USSR and other European socialist countries. These processes have really extended beyond the framework of the socialist world and have become a major factor of the planet's political life.

Life is constantly posing fresh tasks before the peoples who have chosen the socialist path, and the solution of these tasks requires both new forms and new methods. This is a natural process, and one could even assume that the diversity of development in both socialist and other countries in the world will increase in the coming decades.

But some people would obviously like to turn these processes to their advantage. Certain forces of the Western powers—the FRG, for example—are especially excited by recent events in the GDR, Poland, and Hungary. Of course, the processes in the socialist countries are not homogeneous. What they do have in common is the quest for effective ways to renew socialism and to overcome the deformations which have come to light. In some cases this quest is leading to the attainment of this goal, while in others it may also create a certain threat of the loss of socialist gains.

Political forces which are incapable of extricating themselves from the morass of anticommunism are now rubbing their hands: We have spent decades waiting for socialism's collapse and disintegration, and now it looks as if our longed-for goal is about to materialize. Let us not engage in polemics with the authors of such claims—time will show who is right. Today I would like to ask just one question: Are these oracles familiar with the lessons of history? Do they remember the high price that the peoples had to pay in the past for attempts to "roll back socialism," do they remember how international relations were disfigured by these attempts? Do these circles intend to give a little thought to the calamities that such an adventurist policy could bring upon mankind today?

It is not all that hard to imagine the possible fatal consequences of an attempt to question the postwar agreements on the peace settlement in Europe, or to start retreating from the letter and spirit of the Helsinki Final Act. After all, some hotheads are even now beginning to make noises about the so-called German question. It is easy to see which forces would benefit from the chaos which would be the inevitable result of an attempt to start a reckless game with Europe's future.

A major mistake is being made by those who would attempt to embark on outside interference in the affairs of peoples in the process of solving their own domestic problems. For example, an apt warning was issued by U.S. journalist Flora Lewis who wrote in THE NEW YORK TIMES recently: "The West is acting as if the only possibility lies in returning to the European order which existed between the two world wars. But if this were possible, it would be a catastrophe." I would only add that it is by no means the entire West which is acting in this way; there are quite a few politicians there who are aware of the folly and danger of the extremist circles' calls.

Yes, the Soviet Union and some other socialist countries are now experiencing considerable difficulties. Of course, the reduction of arms and armed forces now being unilaterally implemented by the Soviet Union and

the process of conversion in our defense industry facilitate the alleviation of these difficulties. But is the United States, for example, without difficulties of its own? It can hardly be claimed that the $500,000-plus per minute which the United States has cast into the maw of the military Moloch over the last few decades has helped its prosperity or the consolidation of its positions. It is a fact that the U.S. federal budget deficit in fiscal 1989, which ended 30 September, was in excess of $152 billion, while the U.S. national debt has reached $2.8 trillion. It can be assumed, therefore, that we are not the only ones with a headache....

Does this not mean that the emerging prospect of reversing the arms race will make it possible not only to ease the burden borne by the economy, but also to find a different solution to the task of ensuring the states' proper defense capability? It is far more sensible to break out of the steel vise of large military budgets and not only reduce the threat of war but also channel the resources thus released to the benefit of the peoples.

As regards the prospects of our country emerging from its present difficult patch, I believe it would be appropriate to cite a conclusion drawn by E.A. Hewett, senior fellow of the Brookings Institution in Washington: "We should not overestimate the Soviet Union's economic weakness, either. This system has its strong sides and major reserves: A gigantic defense industry, which even today produces world-class technology; a powerful but still not fully extended corps of scientists and scientific workers; vast mineral reserves; a small external debt; a well-trained work force. And these are by no means all the favorable factors." Perestroyka is indeed intending to bring all these factors into action and to fully reveal socialism's mighty potential.

I believe that statesmen and politicians in the nonsocialist world are acting with foresight when they note that the perestroyka processes in the USSR can only meet the interests of the West itself as well.

UN General Assembly Discusses Cambodia Situation

LD1611114289 Moscow TASS in English 0906 GMT 16 Nov 89

[Text] New York November 16 TASS—By TASS correspondent Mikhail Kochetkov:

The 44th session of the United Nations General Assembly is discussing the alarming situation in Cambodia. Many delegates have emphasised the need to prevent the Khmer Rouge, who have stained this long-suffering country in blood, from returning to power. This was stressed by practically all the speakers.

The French delegate, speaking on behalf of the 12 EEC nations, said that they would never countenance a Khmer Rouge comeback.

The speakers expressed practically identical views during the first day of the debate. They urged the Cambodian sides to continue the dialogue they had begun and to progress to the second round of the international conference on Cambodia without delay.

However, there are some disagreements about how to solve outstanding issues. They were reflected in the attitude of delegates towards the draft resolution submitted by Indonesia on behalf of a rather large group of states.

This document, unfortunately, is still marked by the obsolete approaches of past years. Politically and psychologically the draft resolution obviously conflicts with the spirit of mutual understanding achieved at the Jakarta informal meetings and at the international conference on Cambodia in Paris.

Regretfully the authors of the draft refused to recognise the withdrawal of Vietnamese troops from Cambodia, because it was carried out without international supervision.

It is common knowledge, however, that the Vietnamese and Cambodian sides repeatedly invited international inspectors to Cambodia. The Vietnamese delegate said that the final stage of the withdrawal was watched by representatives from the governments of 17 states, including 11 non-aligned nations, as well as from six international organisations and hundreds of foreign journalists.

However, this did not impress the authors of the draft. They are actually suggesting the return of Vietnamese troops to Cambodia and then their subsequent withdrawal, this time within the "framework of a general settlement."

"Such distorted logic ignore political realities, deadlock negotiations and interfere with U.N. peace-making efforts in Cambodia," Soviet delegate Aleksandr Belonogov stressed. "In these conditions," he continued, "the USSR is forced to oppose the draft resolution. The people of Cambodia have the right to expect constructive decisions from the United Nations to create a favourable atmosphere for a comprehensive settlement of the Cambodian problem and to promote negotiations both at inter-Khmer and international levels."

"The Soviet Union contends that the Cambodians and all states concerned should both seek ways to settle unresolved problems. It is very important for the Cambodian sides to display restraint in the military sphere and to cease fire immediately. This could be facilitated by a moratorium on outside arms and supplies deliveries to the conflicting Cambodian sides," Belonogov said.

"Deliveries of arms to the opposition groups can no longer be justified by the need to combat 'foreign intervention', since all foreign troops have been withdrawn

from Cambodia. Continued military assistance to the opposition," the Soviet delegate stressed, "is tantamount to encouraging Khmer Rouge attempts to seize power again."

"The Soviet Union," he pointed out, "is prepared to cooperate with the other states concerned and to contribute to the solution of the Cambodian issue in order to break the deadlock in South-East Asia."

United States & Canada

TASS Reports Bush Speech on Upcoming Summit

LD1611074189 Moscow TASS in English 0732 GMT 16 Nov 89

[Text] Washington November 16 TASS—U.S. President George Bush praised the changes which are taking place in the Soviet Union and other East European countries—including in the trade union movement—in his speech at the 18th convention of the American Federation of Labour—Congress of Industrial Organisations (AFL-CIO), the biggest U.S. trade union organisation.

He said that "the new legislation in the Supreme Soviet recognising the right to strike in all but a handful of essential industries would be a challenge" to the Soviet leadership which at the same time is trying to raise productivity and living standards through perestroyka.

Bush said that it was against this background that he would meet President Gorbachev near Malta next month.

"We are not meeting to negotiate the future of Europe. The peoples of Eastern Europe are speaking their own minds about that future. They are calling for democracy, freedom of press and of conscience and the right of the governed to choose their leaders."

The U.S. President emphasised that he would work to advance that process of reform and democracy. "I also want to know what President Gorbachev thinks of the challenges he faces at home—and of the new course that he has set out for Soviet policy in Eastern Europe. I also want to talk with President Gorbachev about opportunities to move beyond containment in U.S.-Soviet relations—to find areas of mutual advantage in our relationship.

U.S. Attitude to Soviet GATT Membership

90UI0114A Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian No 45, 8 Nov 89 p 9

[Report from NOVOSTI correspondent Edgar Cheporov for LITERATURNAYA GAZETA: "On Moral Purity, GATT, and Perestroyka"]

[Text] New York—Speaking now of the December summit, many commentators agree that a principal topic in the discussions of the leaders of the USSR and the United States could be the two countries' trade relations and the Soviet Union's place in the world economic process. There are many grounds for such forecasts. The U.S. leadership has spoken in support of the success of the Soviet perestroyka. This position should most likely presuppose also a search for paths of equal, mutually profitable cooperation. This is why now, on the eve of the summit, the following question is being heard increasingly often here: Does Washington intend changing its attitude toward the prospects of Moscow's participation in such international organizations as the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), the IMF [International Monetary Fund] and a number of others?

The GATT, in the language of the reference works, is a multilateral intergovernmental agreement whose purpose is the lowering of customs dues and other barriers in trade. At one time we high-handedly ignored this organization and called it a "rich man's club," despite the fact that countries of the most varied prosperity were united therein. It is impossible to exaggerate the GATT's role in the modern world. Regulation within the framework of this organization now encompasses more than 90 percent of the world trade in finished products, machinery and equipment included. It is believed that at the start of the 1990's GATT rules will extend to farm commodities, raw material and service trade also.

Need it be shown that the joining of such an organization would be in the interests of perestroyka? The USSR's membership in GATT, THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR writes, would strengthen the positions of the supporters of perestroyka inside the USSR in the struggle against those who are impeding it. But the newspaper also believes that the USSR's integration in the world economy "would give international trade and finances a most powerful boost." It is noteworthy that none of the opponents of the USSR's admittance to GATT directly opposes this proposition. The delineation occurs in accordance with a different principle: Is it not too early for the Soviet Union to be joining the organization, is it ready for such cooperation? What is it that the opponents of the USSR's joining of GATT do not like? Once in this organization, they maintain, the Russians will adopt obstructionist, ideologized positions and will aspire to the creation of blocs with some participants against others. The main complaint, however, is that the USSR's centralized economic system is "contrary to the very nature of GATT."

These arguments are now convincing to far from everyone in the United States or in the West generally. After all, GATT, they object, has already accepted Czechoslovakia, Cuba, Hungary, Poland and Romania, and negotiations are under way on the participation therein of the PRC and Bulgaria. And all this has been to the benefit of world trade.

"When these countries were admitted to GATT," P. Desai, professor at Columbia University told me, "they were far less market-oriented than the custodians of the 'moral purity' of this organization would have liked. And, consequently, the objections to the admittance of the USSR cannot be considered telling. Yes, membership in GATT affords countries with a centralized economy access to our markets, whereas they themselves are not yet in a position to afford an equivalent outlet—their market and prices are controlled by the planned system and bureaucrats. There is no completely satisfactory solution to this problem. But GATT has negotiated with these countries on their undertaking to increase

imports annually in determined amounts. So, one wonders, why not do the same with the USSR also?"

"Would participation in GATT, in your view, help the success of the Soviet perestroyka?"

"Undoubtedly! It would afford the Soviet Union an opportunity to effect integration in the world trade system more quickly. I do not believe that the West should insist that the USSR may participate in GATT only after the latter has accomplished the reform of the economy. This would be just as unintelligent as putting the cart before the horse."

"Why, then, in this case are the United States and a number of its partners not yet prepared to open the GATT door to the USSR?"

"Conservative politicians are doing this for primarily ideological reasons. The attitude toward the USSR as a superpower opposed to the United States still makes itself felt in the trade and economic sphere. Nonetheless, I believe that both the Administration and politicians in Washington have already begun to switch to more sensible positions...."

Unearthing of Past Soviet Disasters Pondered

PM1511144989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 6

[IZVESTIYA special correspondents A. Illesh and A. Shalnev dispatch: "The Way It Was. Commentary on the Book 'Unearthing Soviet Catastrophes'"]

[Text] New York-Moscow—Houston, Texas, the NASA Space Control Center. James Oberg, the author of the book "Unearthing Soviet Catastrophes," which was published recently in the United States, works here. The weighty tome describes hundreds of tragic events that have happened in the USSR since the thirties up to the present day. Explosions at plants, ship sinkings, abortive rocket launches, terrorist acts, and even hoof-and-mouth disease raging through the Urals and Siberia—all this is included in the unusual manuscript. It is understandable that most of the facts, particularly those relating to the preperestroyka period, have not been covered in the Soviet mass media. Oberg has compiled this list from Western sources and unclassified documents kept at U.S. military and intelligence departments.

What compelled him to take up his pen and engage in such unusual work?

"I have been interested in Soviet technology for a long time, since my childhood. The interest was aroused by the first satellite. I was 12 years old at the time," Oberg said. "Why am I unearthing these things? It is a kind of challenge to those people who want to keep things secret: Remember, there will always be someone who wants to learn a secret. That is human nature. Second—and this is the main thing—we must learn from one another's experience. Including tragic experience."

[Correspondents] Aren't you afraid that your book will rapidly become outmoded? Glasnost in the USSR is enabling a great deal to be published today. There may be people in our country now who are unearthing these kind of secrets...

[Oberg] "Some of the incidents I mention in this book have indeed been published in your press very recently. But there are considerable elements that retain their topicality."

...Air Force Captain V. Kulyapin downed a transporter belonging to an Argentinian aviation company 18 July 1981. The aircraft had been chartered for a secret shipment of weapons from Israel via Cyprus to Iran. On board the aircraft there were three crew members—Argentinian nationals—and a British subject representing the interests of the firm supplying the weapons. The aircraft was downed on its way back from Tehran to Cyprus when, as a result of crew error, the aircraft was not in Turkish air space but over Azerbaijan. The aircraft traveled along the border over Soviet territory for 10-20 minutes and was eliminated by Kulyapin.

[Correspondents] But how are you able to confirm what you have written?

[Oberg] "Indirectly—even from Soviet sources. KRASNAYA ZVEZDA later published a report on the incident. From this it follows that Kulyapin is a hero who stopped a hostile backlash. But I am convinced that the incident could have been avoided if the Soviet air traffic control service had established contact with the aircraft.

"Alas, USSR official sources omitted to mention a very important detail—that the downed aircraft was Argentine," James continued. "We cannot help but be amazed by that since Argentina's ambassador in Moscow drove out to the scene of the catastrophe and the aircraft's tail bearing the Argentinian flag was still lying among the wreckage (at that time)... A year ago I myself brought a poster from Moscow depicting Kulyapin and his aircraft destroying something very reminiscent of a B-52."

On the whole this book cites more than enough data about most diverse incidents linked with our secret departments. Unfortunately, it is very hard even today to check many of them out. For instance, an explosion at a supply depot in Severomorsk which received extensive coverage in the Western press. But this "elaborate" tale was confirmed by international organizations.

...June 1985. A rocket that was putting a payload into orbit developed faults: The engines cut out ahead of schedule. The rocket fell back into the atmosphere but some fragments of the upper section went into orbit. Oberg writes that the fragments were so small that they were not noticed by Soviet radars. But they were picked up by U.S. radars. When the Soviet Union presented its next monthly report in accordance with the Convention on the Registration of Space Facilities, it failed to mention this rocket launch. Obviously because, from the official viewpoint, it simply did not exist. Thus Moscow

violated its international commitments, which require the United Nations to be informed of the launch of any rocket putting a payload into orbit. Admittedly these fragments fell out of orbit quite soon and burned up... Oberg believes that was the only way the Soviet Union succeeded in avoiding a scandal.

"At one time there was a great deal of talk about an explosion in the Salang tunnel in Afghanistan in 1979. According to my data, hundreds of people died then. Alas, the Soviet public still knows nothing about this," Oberg said.

But times are, indeed, changing: It did not prove that difficult to elucidate this tragedy. Lieutenant Colonel (Justice) V. Shein, investigator for particularly important cases, at the Main Military Prosecutor's Office, relates:

"To begin, there have been no explosions at all at Salang. This must obviously relate to the tragedy that occurred 3 November 1982. Here are the materials from the criminal case. It is clear from them that, owing to a snowfall, a great deal of Soviet and Afghan equipment accumulated at both ends of this long (more than 4 km) tunnel. The chief of the operations group gave the 'all clear' and the convoy began to move up from the south. But, since the road in the north was also obstructed with equipment, he also authorized this convoy to enter Salang. The two convoys were heading toward one another. In the middle of the tunnel two vehicles crashed unexpectedly. A blockage arose involving almost another 11 vehicles. Our drivers did not switch off their engines, they knew their batteries were 'weak.' Carbon monoxide built up as a result of the idling diesel engines... As a result 64 Soviet servicemen died. Some 2 senior officers, 6 junior officers, 2 ensigns, 5 petty officers, and the rest rank-and-file servicemen. According to Afghan militia data, 112 Afghans died."

But even before this there were major troubles on the Salang. In December 1979 12 servicemen died. In spring 1980 two people died. After the 1982 tragedy traffic was only authorized in one direction in this tunnel—either southward or northward. Rigid control was established making it possible to avoid losses here in the future.

Oberg's book cites instances of fires at Soviet nuclear power stations prior to Chernobyl. Understandably, our newspapers hushed them up. We turned to the USSR Nuclear Society and the USSR MVD Fire Protection Main Administration for explanations.

...The fire at the Beloyarsk nuclear electric power station [AES]. It happened on New Year's Eve 1978. The firefighting unit received the alarm signal at 0150 hours. The report was then sent on to Sverdlovsk's central firefighting communications point almost an hour later—the intercity line was engaged and there was no direct line. Unfortunately, there was no attempt to control the fire before the firefighters arrived. The fire was eliminated at 1130; 35 operations units and 270 fire protection workers were involved in putting out the fire, including more than 150 who were equipped with breathing apparatus. As a result of the accident 25 AES personnel were poisoned by products of combustion and there were also cases of frostbite. The cover of the machine shop caved in over an area of 960 square kms. The damage totaled R280,000.

Our press only carried a sentence about the fire at the Armenian AES. We can now report the details. It happened 15 October 1982. At 1010 the personnel on duty roused the unit guarding the AES. The foam fire extinguisher which AES staffers tried to operate did not work.... Firefighters arrived in 3 minutes but their efforts were clearly inadequate. It was hard to summon additional units: The telephone communications there were also quite useless. Help only arrived an hour or more later. At 1200 hours the situation sharply deteriorated—two turbogenerators were suddenly cranked into the system and a massive short circuit occurred. Followed by an explosion. The machine shop could have burned down altogether... New subunits were summoned and it only proved possible to overcome the fire at 1658. The total damage was approximately R1 million.

The fire at the Zaporozhye AES is another "shady area." It was discovered at 1715 hours, 27 January 1984. Engineers tried to extinguish the blazing cables with their jackets—there were no fire extinguishers in the building... But the smoke instantaneously shrouded everyone and they were forced to flee. Vigorous actions to put out the fire only began at 2230 hours when firefighting units from Zaporozhye and other cities in the oblast arrived at the AES. There was a delay in information here—the report about the fire was only received at Zaporozhye 2 and ½ hours later (!). And the fire was only extinguished at 1110 hours the following day. The direct damage totalled almost R1.5 million. This fire was extremely complex and, as a result, specialists believe, there was even the threat that the reactor's security systems would be destroyed...

...You may, of course, believe the U.S. researcher or you may not. You can prove him wrong and "seize on" various inaccuracies. How can there fail to be inaccuracies? For those people who had a thorough knowledge of the essence of each incident kept silent. Safeguarding their administrative and personal peace and quiet, many people have been silent until now. We think something else in this book is important—the attempt to recollect events as they really happened. Since life has shown that silence incites us to repeat our dreadful mistakes, an unlearned lesson is like a new mine with an armed fuse. However, Oberg proved once again that no one has yet succeeded in hiding any truth for long. Information will be leaked in one way or another, and blaze a trail for itself. But it is important to ensure that this happens more rapidly.

"If, say, people in the United States had known about the death of cosmonaut Bondarenko, we would possibly have avoided a similar situation when 3 astronauts died in a fire," Oberg claimed. "Let us look at this from the

other side now: If you had thoroughly studied the accident at the Three Mile Island nuclear electric power station, it is not impossible that you would have prevented the catastrophe at Chernobyl..."

Talking to the researcher and studying the documents he has published, we reached another conclusion. Today the mass media bristles with reports about catastrophes and tragedies—small and large on transport, in the Army, in production, in domestic life... You get the impression of an avalanche of disasters suddenly striking the country. Oberg's book draws the unequivocal conclusion that there have always been accidents in the USSR. It is at the least stupid to blame the democratic changes in the country for this. On the contrary, making such facts public is a guarantee that conclusions will be drawn from them.

China

Border, Confidence-Building Discussed With PRC

OW1411184289 Moscow in Mandarin to Southeast Asia
1200 GMT 14 Nov 89

[Text] In Moscow, Soviet and Chinese diplomatic and military experts have begun to discuss the issue of troop reductions in the Soviet-Chinese border areas and the issue of confidence-building in the military field.

An accord on holding such a meeting was reached at the summit meeting of Soviet and Chinese leaders held in Beijing last May.

The Soviet side is headed by Kireyev, chief of the Directorate of Socialist Asian Countries of the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The Chinese side is headed by Liu Guangzhi, deputy chief of the Department of USSR and East European Countries of the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

CPC Plenum Approves Deng Xiaoping Retirement

PM1411161789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
11 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 1

[Dispatch by own correspondent Yu. Savenkov: "Plenum Approves Deng Xiaoping's Retirement"]

[Text] Beijing—The CPC, in the shape of its Central Committee, approved on Thursday the retirement of Deng Xiaoping from his post as chairman of the CPC Central Committee Military Council. This was the last leading party post held by the 85-year-old veteran, whose services were spoken of highly by the plenum. As reported by XINHUA, the plenum communique says Deng Xiaoping, albeit in good health, is leaving his post with the fundamental interests of the Party in mind. All participants in the plenum, the agency notes, showed their respect to him for the example he set in tackling the problem of eliminating the system of occupancy of leading positions for life.

Deng put forward the idea of reforming the system of party and state leadership as early as 1980. It is based on two features: collective leadership, and action to counter the excessive concentration of power. In the letter to the CPC Central Committee Politburo in which he tenders his resignation, Deng notes that he also intends to request the National People's Congress to release him from his last official post, that of chairman of the PRC Central Military Council. He has occupied this post, which is effectively that of supreme commander in chief of the Chinese Army, since June 1981. At the 13th CPC Congress, in the fall of 1987, Deng Xiaoping took the first decisive step toward stepping down from leading posts: He was elected to neither the Central Committee nor the Politburo and its Standing Committee. Commentators noted at the time that the veteran was hinting that cadres needed to be younger. Incidentally, the age of candidate and full members of the Politburo elected at the 13th CPC Congress was 7 years younger than the average age of its predecessor.

The plenum approved the decision to appoint Jiang Zemin, general secretary of the CPC Central Committee, to the post of chairman of the CPC Central Committee Military Council. Yang Shangkun, president of the PRC, became first deputy.

The plenum paid great attention to China's economic problems. It was decided to continue efforts to stabilize the economy and deepen reform to ensure stable and harmonious development. The first successes in the policy of restoring the economy go back to last fall: The excessive industrial growth rates have slowed down, a relatively good harvest has been gathered, investments in fixed capital have been gotten under control to some extent, and the trend of rapidly rising prices has slackened off.

The plenum noted that in recent years difficulties and problems have built up against the background of the invariable achievements of a decade of reform. They are temporary, and the conditions for overcoming them exist. The plenum highlighted four main thrusts in the drive to stabilize the economy. The first is reducing overall public demand, tight control of finances, credit, and loans, very strict economies for several years, and reduction in the excessive use of national income for consumption needs. The second is restoring the industrial structure and paying greater attention to agriculture, particularly ensuring the steady growth of grain and cotton production. The third is instilling economic order: In particular, the checking of commercial companies will continue, above all those working in the sphere of circulation, in order to overcome disorder in construction, production, and distribution. And the fourth is improving the management of enterprises and increasing scientific and technical standards and effectiveness.

The plenum urged the party and the people to rally around the Central Committee with "Jiang Zemin as its core," to develop the "glorious traditions of unstinting labor and confidence in our own strength," "to share

happiness and woe," to overcome the temporary economic difficulties, and to carry out the strategic task of quadrupling GNP by the end of the century as compared with 1980.

Li Peng on Deng Stepdown, West's Sanctions

PM1411123789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Li Peng Assesses Situation in China"]

[Text] Beijing, 13 Nov—Deng Xiaoping's retirement, by which he demonstrated his adherence to his principled rejection of the practice of the life tenure of leadership posts, is further confirmation of the stability of the political situation in China. Li Peng, premier of the PRC State Council, stated this at a meeting with a delegation from the Japanese-Chinese Economic Association.

Speaking about the discriminatory measures taken by certain Western countries against China following the suppression of the disturbances in Beijing, Li Peng stressed: "In effect, these are not economic but political sanctions against the PRC." The premier said, inter alia, that they have done China "slight damage"; however, those implementing the sanctions have also suffered at the same time.

CPSU, Defense Group Congratulate Jiang Zemin

LD1511190989 Moscow TASS in English 1837 GMT 15 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 15 TASS—The Soviet Communist Party Central Committee and the USSR Defence Council sent a telegram to Chinese Communist Party leader Jiang Zemin today conveying sincere congratulations on the occasion of his election as chairman of the Central Military Commission.

The telegram wished Jiang Zemin success in his activities in the interests of the Chinese people and strengthening of peace and international security.

PRAVDA Notes Kim Il-song Visit to PRC

PM1511152989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Nov 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Results of Visit"]

[Text] Beijing, 13 Nov—XINHUA reported today that Kim Il-song, general secretary of the Workers Party of Korea [WPK] Central Committee and president of the DPRK, paid an unofficial visit to China on 5 through 7 November. He had talks in Beijing with Jiang Zemin, general secretary of the CPC Central Committee, and Deng Xiaoping, chairman of the PRC Central Military Council, and met with Li Peng, premier of the PRC State Council, PRC President Yang Shangkun, and other Chinese leaders.

The sides briefed one another on the situation in their countries and exchanged opinions on questions of the further development of friendly Sino-Korean interstate and interparty relations, problems of international life, and other questions of mutual interest. The sides secured full unity of views on all questions under discussion, the agency indicated. The meetings and talks made it possible to further deepen mutual understanding and strengthen friendship and cooperation between the two parties and countries.

The PRC and DPRK leaders stated their determination to follow the socialist path and abide by the principles of party leadership.

The Chinese side expressed support for the WPK and the DPRK Government and people in their struggle for the country's peaceful reunification and the struggle to relax tension on the Korean Peninsula.

The Korean side stated its resolute support for the CPC and the Chinese people in the struggle to uphold the four cardinal principles, reform, and the policy of external openness, and the struggle to build socialism with a specific Chinese character.

In the course of the meetings and talks, which took place in an exceptionally cordial and friendly atmosphere, the XINHUA report pointed out, mutual satisfaction at the current level of Sino-Korean relations and a desire to further develop them were expressed.

Northeast Asia

Yakovlev, Delegation Continue Visit to Japan

PRAVDA on 13 Nov Meetings

PM1511141989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Nov 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Delegation's Stay"]

[Text] Tokyo, 13 Nov—For the USSR Supreme Soviet delegation headed by A.N. Yakovlev, chairman of the CPSU Central Committee International Policy Commission, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, member of the Politburo, and USSR people's deputy, the working day began with a visit to the Japanese parliament, where it had meetings with H. Tamura, speaker of the House of Representatives, and Y. Tsuchiya, speaker of the House of Councillors.

In the course of the conversations, which were of a substantive character and were attended by influential members of both chambers of the Japanese parliament representing both Japan's ruling Liberal-Democratic Party [LDP] and opposition parties, the head of the USSR Supreme Soviet delegation spoke about the Soviet parliament's activity and the perestroyka processes developing in the Soviet Union and described the essence of its current phase. Great attention was paid to questions of developing interparliamentary ties between the USSR and Japan as an important element in bilateral

relations, where changes for the better are making themselves felt increasingly noticeably.

The speakers of the chambers of the Japanese parliament indicated that people in their country are following with great interest the course of perestroyka in the USSR. They stressed the great significance of the policy of new thinking for improving East-West relations, alleviating tension, and ensuring peace and security on the planet. The Japanese side also voiced the opinion that the conclusion of a peace treaty based on the resolution of the "territorial problem" must be the basis for establishing truly stable relations with the USSR.

The Soviet delegation head indicated that in the modern world all misunderstandings must be eliminated as quickly as possible and this must be done on the basis of a realistic approach. The organism for interstate relations must be cured as a whole rather than in parts. The same thing also applies to bilateral relations. Success is obtained when both sides are equally active. Today everyone can see that the Soviet Union is full of activeness in foreign policy.

There was a meeting the same day between the USSR Supreme Soviet delegation and Japanese Prime Minister T. Kaifu. The conversation took place in a businesslike and constructive spirit and touched on various aspects of Soviet-Japanese relations. It also broached certain international problems of mutual interest. T. Kaifu stressed that the Japanese Government attaches great importance to improving relations with the Soviet Union and advocates their balanced development.

A.N. Yakovlev said that the Soviet side regards this stance on Japan's part as constructive and intends to embark on further dynamizing Soviet-Japanese relations in order to open a new chapter there in accordance with the current accord. This can be achieved if we follow principles that have already proved their effectiveness in resolving the most complex problems, namely the presence of political will, consideration for realities, and balance of interests. The Soviet leadership attaches exceptionally great importance to its relations with Japan and would like to see them really good-neighborly and filled with full-blooded substance. We are profoundly convinced that the need to impart such a character to bilateral relations is dictated both by the two countries' national interests and by the broader goals of ensuring security and stability in the world and above all in our common home—the Asia-Pacific region.

The delegation met with Japanese Foreign Minister T. Nakayama. The conversation with him took shape amid a frank exchange of opinions on questions of Soviet-Japanese relations and international policy. Expressing satisfaction at the positive changes in the atmosphere on the planet, which have not bypassed relations between the two countries, the participants in the conversation pointed out that they still have to do a great deal to ensure that the quality and volume of Soviet-Japanese relations fully accords with the place and role of the Soviet Union and Japan in the modern world. The further development of political dialogue must play an important role in this. Now that approximate dates have been determined for a summit level visit to Japan, it is time to begin in earnest the practical preparations for it and organize further Soviet-Japanese contacts from this viewpoint.

The delegation had a conversation with I. Ozawa, general secretary of Japan's ruling LDP. Welcoming the Soviet parliamentarians, he spoke with satisfaction about the accord that has been reached regarding the establishment of direct ties between the LDP and the CPSU as the ruling parties of Japan and the Soviet Union. A.N. Yakovlev pointed out that people in the USSR will be glad to welcome a LDP delegation. He expressed the hope that this visit will initiate regular interparty contacts and open yet another channel for dialogue between the two countries.

The meetings were attended by N.N. Solovyev, USSR ambassador to Japan.

In the evening a reception was held in honor of the Soviet legislators on behalf of the speakers of both chambers of Japan's parliament.

Welcoming the USSR Supreme Soviet delegation, H. Tamura said, inter alia:

Our countries are geographical neighbors but our natural environment, living conditions, and other factors are considerably different. Nevertheless many Japanese love your country's literature, music, and ballet. In the last few years there have been active contacts in the field of science, culture, sport, and so forth. As for the reforms that are now being vigorously implemented in the USSR, such words as "perestroyka" and "glasnost" are widely known to the Japanese people, who show broad interest in the development of political and public life in your country.

Relations of interdependence are growing increasingly stronger in the world now, and no state can exist without peace and friendship. We are convinced that your country, which has abided by a peace-loving course for almost 50 years and preserved friendly relations with all states, is contributing to the cause of universal peace and prosperity. We wholeheartedly wish to consolidate the foundations of peace with such an important neighbor as your country and establish firm relations of trust with it on the basis of true mutual understanding.

We hope that the visit to Japan by Mr Gorbachev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, scheduled for 1991 will bring about the rapid development of Japanese-Soviet relations and will be of epochal significance in the history of the two countries. We are also convinced that the Soviet parliamentary delegation's current visit will enable us to take a new step toward establishing friendship between our two countries.

In his reply speech A.N. Yakovlev said, in part:

It is 5 years since Soviet legislators' previous visit to Japan but this is the first delegation from our new parliament. Five years is a considerable period in present-day terms. Both in the life of the Soviet Union and in the world this period has been marked by changes of a most substantial and historic scale and character. Changes of an irreversible nature in many respects and—we are firmly convinced of this—changes for the better, changes toward freedom for man, a democratic social system, and prosperity for people.

When violence enters a house, justice leaves, the Japanese proverb says. But when violence leaves a house, justice does not return right away. However, it is far easier for it to return. Today violence is beginning, slowly at first, to be forced out of our common home—the planet Earth—reluctantly, as it were, against resistance. This inspires hope and strengthens the belief in the attainability of a better, more just, secure, and humane world.

It is under these conditions that dialogue is being resumed between our two countries' parliamentarians. Against the backdrop of new realities in world and internal policy, against the backdrop of changes which 3-4 years ago seemed inconceivable, against the backdrop not only of hope but also the clear realization of the new possibilities. They loudly call for and demand realism.

But this is realism of a special kind. Not of the kind that timidly and calculatingly counts up the "pros" and "cons," confining itself merely to overcautious half steps and half-measures. But realism of that supreme destiny which sees present-day trends and finds guidelines in them for building a future life in a more sensible, worthy, and successful manner. M.S. Gorbachev spoke about such realism at Vladivostok in 1986 and Krasnoyarsk in 1988.

It is now time for practical conclusions and steps to be taken from the experience of stepping up dialogue and mutual understanding. I am convinced that our peoples will welcome such a crucial turnaround. For its part the Soviet Union firmly advocates the development and deepening of positive trends.

14 Nov Activities Noted

PM1511165489 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Nov 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Soviet Parliamentarians Continue Their Meetings in Japan"]

[Text] Tokyo, 14 Nov—Emperor Akihito of Japan today received USSR People's Deputy A.N. Yakovlev, Politburo member and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the CPSU Central Committee International Policy Commission, who is head of a USSR Supreme Soviet delegation which is in Japan at the invitation of the chairmen of the chambers of the Japanese parliament.

A.N. Yakovlev conveyed to the emperor of Japan an oral message from M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

During the audience a talk took place between A.N. Yakovlev and Emperor Akihito, in the course of which the two sides expressed a united opinion on the importance of deepening mutual understanding and developing cooperation between the Soviet and Japanese peoples on the basis of good-neighborliness and mutual respect.

A.N. Yakovlev had meetings today with S. Abe, a prominent figure in the ruling Liberal Democratic Party; K. Ishida, chairman of the Clean Government Party Central Executive Committee; E. Nagasue, chairman of the Democratic Socialist Party Central Executive Committee; and S. Eda, chairman of the Social Democratic Federation.

During the talks, questions of bilateral relations and the further development of contacts between the CPSU and the said parties and between the Soviet and Japanese public were touched on.

It was noted, in particular, that the views of the Soviet side and the Clean Government Party coincide on the point that politics should serve man as the highest value, with the emphasis on achieving peace and security. At the meeting with the leaders of that party and of the Social Democratic Federation, emphasis was placed on the significance of the ecological problem and the importance of achieving economic progress, which must not be paid for by destroying man's environment. The participants in the talks were unanimous in their striving for the ideals of disarmament and the eradication of confrontation from the practice of international relations.

On the same day the delegation had a meeting with members of the parliamentary association of Japanese-Soviet friendship. In his speech I. Sakurauchi, chairman of the association, welcomed the USSR Supreme Soviet delegation's visit. Acknowledging the importance of parliamentary exchanges in improving the atmosphere in Soviet-Japanese relations, he came out in favor of their further development and the quest for new forms of such cooperation. Japanese parliamentary deputies and members of the association set forth the Japanese side's viewpoint on Japanese-Soviet relations.

In his reply speech A.N. Yakovlev noted the importance of Soviet-Japanese parliamentary exchanges and gave a high assessment of the association's activity in establishing good-neighborly relations between the two countries and deepening mutual understanding between the peoples of the USSR and Japan.

In all the meetings and talks held on this day the Japanese politicians noted the interest felt by their country's public in perestroyka and the course of transformations, spoke of their wishes for the success of renewal processes in Soviet society, and stressed M.S.

Gorbachev's role in putting forward initiatives and implementing the policy of democratization and glasnost not only in the USSR, but worldwide.

The individual programs of the USSR Supreme Soviet delegation members are very busy. Today they had meetings with members of Japanese parliamentary commissions and representatives of the government, local organs of power, and business circles.

Yu.V. Golik and O.O. Suleymenov, members of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Questions of Legislation, Legality, and Law and Order, visited the legal commission of the Japanese parliament's House of Councilors. A. Kuroyanagi, its chairman, spoke about the procedure for passing laws, the activity of parliamentary commissions, and the participation of deputies from various political parties in their work. The Soviet parliamentarians briefed their Japanese colleagues on the structure of the USSR's new highest legislative body and its tasks. A wish was expressed for the two countries' parliamentary links to be regular.

Questions of economic methods of management, the financing of scientific research, and the increasing role of information science in society were examined at meetings between Yu.V. Gulyayev, chairman of the Soviet of the Union Commission for Transport, Communications, and Information Science Questions Subcommission on Communications and Information Science, and members of the House of Representatives commission on communications and also the science and technology commissions of the two chambers of the Japanese parliament. They noted the mutual desire to develop cooperation, which is promoted by the current perestroyka in the USSR and the trend toward an improvement in bilateral relations.

USSR People's Deputy V.I. Boldin visited the Ito Khamu [as published] meat combine in Chiba prefecture, where modern technology is making it possible to do away with the most ecologically dirty shops. Representatives of the company's leadership noted that it was the first time the firm had received a Soviet legislator, and it has hitherto had no business contacts with enterprises in the USSR. But that possibility could now emerge. The deputy, for his part, stressed that good prospects are now opening up for the development of trade and economic ties between the two countries.

The municipal administration of the central Tokyo district of Minato received a visit from V.Ya. Stadnik, member of the Supreme Soviet Committee for Questions of the Work of Soviets of People's Deputies and the Development of Management and Self-Management. He studied the structure and organization of the district administration's work. There was an interesting exchange of opinions on questions of the electoral system in the USSR and Japan, the financing of the budgets of local organs of power, and their role in resolving ecological problems.

O.O. Suleymenov met with Kh. Kudziraoka [name as published], deputy chairman of the Parliamentary Association for the Promotion of Disarmament and deputy of the House of Representatives from the Liberal Democratic Party. During the talk the question of the role of parliamentarians in the struggle for a nuclear-free world was touched on. The USSR people's deputy spoke about the "Nevada-Semipalatinsk" antinuclear movmenet, of which he is chairman.

A detailed discussion of peasant cooperatives took place at the Japanese Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, and Fisheries, which was visited by V.A. Tikhonov, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Economic Reform Questions.

Meets JSP's Doi, Sees Progress on Korea

OW1611025689 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 15 Nov 89

[Text] A Supreme Soviet delegation met with Japan Socialist Party [JSP] Chairwoman Takako Doi in Tokyo today. The delegation, led by CPSU Central Committee Politburo member Yakovlev, is on an official visit to Japan. At the meeting with Chairwoman Doi, delegation head Yakovlev touched on international issues and stated that changes taking place in Eastern European are healthy moves.

At the meeting, Mr Yakovlev indicated the possibility of forward-looking dialogue making progress on the Korean Peninsula and, at the same time, expressed his concern over the presence of U.S. troops in South Korea.

The Soviet delegation held meetings with leaders of Komeito and the Social Democratic Federation yesterday.

Tells Doi No Rush on Territories

OW1511065489 Tokyo NHK General Television Network in Japanese 0610 GMT 15 Nov 89

[Text] Visiting CPSU Politburo member Yakovlev today met Japan Socialist Party [JSP] Chairwoman Doi and said that a conclusion on the northern territories issue need not be rushed and that it would be better for both sides to discuss the question at length.

During the meeting, Yakovlev said that although he knows very well Japan's position, politicians must deal with the problem realistically. He said that he hoped that sufficient time will be allocated for a working level group of experts of both countries to study the issue in detail, without rushing for a conclusion. He thus expressed his view that enough time should be devoted to the resolution of the issue.

On the situation on the Korean Peninsula, Yakovlev said that he believes that the USSR's improvement of relations with the ROK is also in the interest of the DPRK, and that the ROK should bring an end to the stationing of U.S. forces in South Korea.

Yakovlev also invited Chairwoman Doi to visit the USSR in spring 1990. Doi replied that if the domestic situation allows it, she will visit the USSR.

Yakovlev also had a meeting with Chief Director Tachiki of the International Affairs Department of the Japan Communist Party [JCP]. During the meeting, Tachiki pointed out that there are pending basic issues between the JCP and the CPSU, such as the participation of a CPSU delegation in the general meeting of the JSP-affiliated Congress for the Prohibition of Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs (Gensuikin). To this, Yakovlev limited himself to saying that it is natural for each party to have certain differences.

Meets With Party Leaders

LD1511091489 Moscow TASS in English 0850 GMT 15 Nov 89

[Text] Tokyo November 15 TASS—Aleksandr Yakovlev, Politburo member and secretary of the Soviet Communist Party (CPSU) Central Committee, met the leaders of Japanese parties here on Tuesday. He is leading a USSR Supreme Soviet delegation.

Bilateral relations, the further development of contacts between the CPSU and Japanese parties and between the Soviet and Japanese public were discussed during meetings with Shintaro Abe, a prominent figure of the ruling Liberal Democratic Party, Koshiro Ishida, chairman of the Central Executive Committee of the Komeito Party, Eichi Nagasue, chairman of the Central Executive Committee of the Democratic Socialist Party, and Satsuki Eda, chairman of the Social Democratic Federation (SDF).

The Soviet side and the Komeito Party agree that politics should serve people as the highest intrinsic value, laying emphasis on the achievement of peace and security.

The importance of the ecological issue and economic progress that does not involve the disruption of man's environment was emphasised during the meeting with Komeito and SDF leaders.

The leaders were unanimous in the desire to realise their ideals of disarmament and of the removal of confrontation from the practice of international relations.

The delegation also met members of the parliamentary association for Japanese-Soviet friendship. The association's chairman Yoshio Sakurachi welcomed the Soviet Parliamentary delegation's visit.

Having recognised the importance of parliamentary exchanges in the improvement of Soviet-Japanese relations, he called for their further development and for a search for new forms of such cooperation.

The association members presented the Japanese side's view of Japanese-Soviet relations.

In a reply speech Yakovlev pointed to the importance of Soviet- Japanese parliamentary exchanges, fully appreciating the association's activities in the establishment of good-neighbourly relations between the two countries and the deepening of mutual understanding between the Soviet and Japanese public.

During all meetings on Tuesday, Japanese political figures spoke of the Japanese people's interest in perestroika and in the course of reforms.

They wished success to the processes of renewal in Soviet society and exphasised the role of Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev in the initiatives and the pursuance of democratisation and openness not only in the Soviet Union but throughout the world as well.

The Soviet delegation on Tuesday also met members of Japanese parliamentary commissions, representatives of the government, local authorities, and the business community.

Receives Nakasone, Other Leaders

LD1511222789 Moscow TASS in English 2148 GMT 15 Nov 89

[Text] Tokyo November 16 TASS—Politburo Member Aleksandr Yakovlev who leads a Supreme Soviet delegation now visiting Japan at the invitation of the Japanese Parliament, met on Wednesday with representatives of the communist and the socialist parties of Japan.

Takako Doi, chairman of the Central Executive Committee of the socialist Party spoke, among other things, about a great impression of her meeting with Mikhail Gorbachev and about the attention with which the Japanese are following the positive dialogue that has started in the world.

The significance of this process and of detente in other areas of international relations for the situation in the Asia-Pacific region was stressed. A broad exchange of opinions was held on Soviet-Japanese relations, key problems of world situation, especially in the APR [Asia-Pacific Region] where our countries are neighbours.

Also on Wednesday Yakovlev met with former premier Yasuhiro Nakasone.

In the afternoon the Soviet parliamentarians met with the leaders of the Keidanren, Japan's business community. They discussed the status and prospects of Soviet-Japanese trade and economic cooperation.

The guests and hosts discussed the problems in the area and noted the existence of important potential. It was pointed out that to achieve desired progress in the area both sides have to make serious coordinated efforts.

Visits Diet; Gives Press Conference

LD1511221689 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 15 Nov 89

[Text] [Announcer] The visit to Japan by a a USSR Supreme Soviet delegation headed by People's Deputy Aleksandr Nikolayevich Yakovlev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, is continuing. Our correspondent Pavel Potapov reports:

[Potapov] Early in the morning, the peoples deputies hastened to the Japanese Diet to continue their acquaintance with the work of the local legislators, particularly in such commissions as the judicial and budget commissions. Comrade Yakovlev, head of the USSR Supreme Soviet delegation, met with the leader of the Japanese socialists, Takako Doi, and with leading members of the Communist Party of Japan. Several aspects of the international situation were discussed, as were problems and prospects of the development of Soviet-Japanese relations and interparty ties.

In the afternoon, Comrade Yakovlev held a press conference for Japanese journalists. Touching on perestroyka in the Soviet Union, he said that it is a most important social experiment, all the results of which can still not be foreseen today. The process of renewal is inevitably going beyond the originally proposed limits. It is awakening the political forces of various trends—left, conservative, moderate, and the most extreme. Comrade Yakovlev characterized the present state of Soviet-Japanese relations in the following way: There is a gradual accumulation of the positive. Political dialogue has been stepped up and has become the guideline in the search for an outlet to new levels. Commercial, economic, scientific, and technical links are developing. We note progress in the cultural and humanitarian spheres. We are for the further development of all these trends, comrade Yakovlev noted.

Moscow TV on News Conference

LD1611010289 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 15 Nov 89

[Video report by V. Tsvetov and A. Koloshin; from the "Vremya" newscast—recorded]

[Text] The official visit to Japan of the delegation of the USSR Supreme Soviet headed by Comrade Yakovlev continues. [video shows busy traffic in a city; Yakovlev, surrounded by unidentified officials taking a seat at a press conference; Yakovlev addressing press conference]

Aleksandr Nikolayevich Yakovlev organized a press conference in the Japanese Journalists' Club today. Touching upon the process of perestroyka which is being carried out in the Soviet Union, Comrade Yakovlev said in particular:

[Yakovlev] The new leadership of the party and state has chosen a difficult and dramatic path, the path of cardinal political and economic reforms. Why are they dramatic? Because of the enormity of the volume of inertia, conservatism, and prejudicial stereoptypes of public consciousness, because of the danger of not being understood by the masses and because of the danger of the opposition of the bureaucratic apparatus for which all that is new conceals a mortal threat. We are now experiencing the difficulties of a transitional period and it is important to understand that a crisis of development is not a dead end.

[Tsvetov] Aleksandr Nikolayevich Yakovlev then went on to list basic directions of the development of perestroyka of the Soviet economy.

[Yakovlev] This is the dismantling of the command methods and system of management, this is a complete and irrevocable break away from the comfortable but socially deadening isolation from the results of one's labor. This is the abolition of the systems of leveling and living at others' expense in all their shapes, this is the recognition of a free market and sound money-commodity relations. This is the equal coexistence and competition of various forms of ownership and the liberation of the individual initiative and entrepreneurship.

[Tsvetov] Speaking about the international significance of the process of perestroyka in the USSR, Comrade Yakovlev noted:

[Yakovlev] I am convinced that perestroyka is tackling not only our internal problems, but that it also has, to a certain degree a universal nature. Only together can we solve for example the nuclear and ecological problems.

[Tsvetov] And this is what comrade Yakovlev said about Soviet-Japanese relations:

[Yakovlev] It is necessary to patiently and consistently clear the path towards concluding a peace treaty on the basis of further deepening Soviet-Japanese relations and on the basis of increasing their volume and quality in all spheres. We impart a special significance to the visit to Japan of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, which is planned for 1991. We proceed from the premise that the future summit meeting will impart a new quality to Japanese-Soviet relations.

We would like to hope that the Japanese side will be guided by this desire, too. The visit to Japan, just like the visit to other countries, requires very careful preparation from both sides, of course. I think that the two sides will prepare with full responsibility for it. We are good neighbors, but we should be even better neighbors.

KYODO Reports Press Conference

OW1511114589 Tokyo KYODO in English 1115 GMT 15 Nov 89

[Text] Tokyo, Nov. 15 KYODO—Soviet Communist Party Politburo Member Aleksandr Yakovlev on Wednesday positively appraised the democratic and

pluralistic reforms sweeping Eastern Europe as "a victory of rationality" and "a victory for socialism."

Yakovlev, who is said to be the No. 2 man in the Kremlin after President Mikhail Gorbachev, also put to rest speculation that Moscow is planning to unveil a proposal to resolve its four-decade-old territorial dispute with Japan. Yakovlev's ambiguous mention Monday of a "third way" of resolving the dispute over four Soviet-held islands claimed by Japan turned out to be merely a reference to "constructive dialogue" already underway between the two countries at the foreign minister level.

The top Kremlin official made the remarks in a meeting with reporters at the Japan National Press Club on the third day of his week-long visit as head of a 23-member parliamentary delegation.

"There is a process going on in Eastern Europe—it is something very normal and it is quite healthy," said Yakovlev.

"In this positive democratic process, there is no threat to anybody ... (except those governments) needing democratization," he said.

Brushing off suggestions that the Soviet Union might resort to military actions to restrain the pro-democracy movement, Yakovlev said such an "anachronistic" use of force would be "doomed" to become a failure of immense human proportions. He said the Soviet Union is determined to firmly uphold its policy of "free social choice" as espoused by Gorbachev in 1985, and interpreted the changes now underway in neighboring countries as occurring along the lines of the Soviet desire to see formed a "common European house."

"Interference in that process might spark a return to the cold war," the former historian warned. "We are standing at just such a juncture."

Yakovlev called the pro-democracy trend "a victory of rationality." "It is not the kind of victory that you can win in a war," he said.

Yakovlev had harsh criticism for Western media interpretations that the changes now sweeping Eastern Europe represent a failure of socialism and of Soviet policy. Calling those views "a strange, obsolete and archaic way of thinking," Yakovlev said such observers are merely witnessing the breakup of their misinformed image of socialism.

"If we are trying to put an end of the cold war, we have to bring in a new way of thinking," he said in reference to the allegedly unwanted criticism.

Yakovlev called the process of democratization in Eastern Europe "a victory of socialism" and foresaw "global implications."

Turning to the bilateral dispute over four islands off Hokkaido, seized by the Soviets in the days after the end of World War II, Yakovlev said he is "fully aware of the position that Japan takes regarding this problem."

"You are not agreeing with our position and the Soviet side is not agreeing with the Japanese position," he said. Expounding on a need for "constructive dialogue" at the foreign minister level and in working groups set up last December on the issue of concluding a belated peace treaty, Yakovlev said: "This constructive dialogue ...is the third way."

The Kremlin diplomacy chief's mention of a "third way" in a meeting Monday with Ichiro Ozawa, secretary general of the ruling Liberal Democratic Party (LDP), had raised expectations here that Moscow may be planning to put forth new proposal to settle the territorial dispute.

"In my words, perhaps you are trying to find some hidden implication—I wish you wouldn't do that," Yakovlev told reporters.

Yakovlev added that the Soviet Union is giving "top priority" to bettering relations with Japan, adding that he hopes the feeling is mutual.

"Political dialogue has become quite vitalized," he said. "What used to be a monologue coming from confronting poles has now become a dialogue rich in implications for the future."

Saying that greater mutual trust and respect would come from further expanding the "scale and quality" of bilateral ties, he added, "if that is the case, all problems would seem so simple—that is what I meant by 'a third way.'"

Yakovlev's remarks echoed his earlier hints in meetings with Japanese officials that a resolution of the territorial issue should be a gradual process preceded by normalization of relations. He told reporters that the dialogue with Japan should be multifaceted, including talks on trade, science and technology, and culture. Japan has traditionaly tried to focus the talks on the territorial question.

"Historic results" have come out of Moscow's dialogue with other countries, including China and the United States, the Soviet party official said.

On Gorbachev's scheduled visit to Japan in 1991, the first ever by a top Soviet leader, Yakovlev said preparations must be put in place "very carefully" in order to make it a success.

Summing up his meetings with Japanese leaders, Yakovlev called them "rich in substance," saying, "we had very useful talks which had a lot of implications."

"The prospect for the future has become clearer," he said.

Tokyo TV on Press Conference

OW1511155489 Tokyo NHK General Television Network
in Japanese 1200 GMT 15 Nov 89

[From the "NHK News Today" program: Report, with excerpts, on a press conference given by Aleksandr Yakovlev, CPSU Politburo member and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and head of a USSR Supreme Soviet delegation visiting Japan, with unidentified reporters at the Japan National Press Club in Tokyo on 15 November; report is interspersed with comments by newscaster Jiro Hirano at the NHK studio in Tokyo and reporter Yoshiro Shimizu at the Diet Press Hall; reporters ask questions in Japanese and Yakovlev responds in Russian, fading into Japanese translation by Harumi Tokunaga; following is from the Japanese—recorded]

[Text] [Newscaster Jiro Hirano in the NHK studio in Tokyo—Subtitles read: "Yakovlev Highly Appraises Democratization in Eastern Europe"] Soviet Politburo Member Yakovlev, who is widely regarded as a strongman second only to Chairman Gorbachev, and who is also a promoter of perestroyka, gave a lecture and a press conference at the Japan National Press Club in Tokyo today.

In the lecture and press conference, which drew attention because of the violent changes under way now in Eastern Europe, Mr Yakovlev said that the democratization moves in Eastern Europe should be regarded not as bankruptcy of Soviet policy, as alleged by some quarters in the West, but as a victory of socialism. He stressed that he welcomes the democratization process in Eastern Europe.

You will hear this news from the Diet Press Hall.

[Reporter Yoshiro Shimizu in the Diet Press Hall] Politburo Member Yakovlev finished a series of talks with Japanese leaders today and is scheduled to proceed to Kyoto tomorrow. His lecture and press conference lasted approximately 1 and ½ hours altogether. Living up to his reputation of being Chairman Gorbachev's braintrust, he sometimes mixed in jokes and was full of suggestions. Here is a question from the press asking whether he thinks the speed of reforms in Eastern Europe is too rapid, and his answer:

[Video shows reporters seated in a hall, cutting to closeup shots of Yakovlev seated, taking notes and later speaking] [Reporter] How do you view the democratization trends in Eastern Europe, which can be likened to an avalanche? Do you think that the tempo is too fast, or do you think that it is all right as it is? Also, with respect to the moves for the reunification of East and West Germany, will the Soviet Union obstruct them even by mobilizing troops, or just watch these moves?

[Yakovlev] We see them as healthy because democratic processes are in progress. I think that these processes have an impact on the entire world. I would like to add one thing; it concerns some Western commentators who take the view that these processes represent a bankruptcy on the part of socialism or a bankruptcy of Soviet policy. This can be called an odd way of thinking or an antiquated way of thinking. Regarding the bankruptcy of socialism, I am afraid it can be said that the image of socialism some commentators have in their minds has gone bankrupt. We think that the process in progress at the present moment is a victory of socialism. Regarding the reunification of the two independent German states, this presents a very hypothetical question. I do not wish to answer a hypothetical question. If someone among you sitting here has the courage to answer such a hypothetical question, I would like to hear his opinion.

[Shimizu] Mr Yakovlev dodged a question on the possibility of mobilizing Soviet troops by saying that the use of armed forces is now completely anachronistic. He said so after grimacing, saying that it is difficult to answer the question without making the questioner lose face.

[Hirano] Mr Shimizu, Mr Yakovlev said that the democratization or reforms taking place in the East European countries is a victory for socialism. His statement is understandable, but there is talk that perestroyka has not been progressing well in the Soviet Union itself lately. Did he say anything in that regard?

[Shimizu] Regarding perestroyka in the Soviet Union, he spoke passionately, using almost all his time for his lecture. Now you will hear the introductory part of that portion.

[Yakovlev] Perestroyka is, so to speak, a great social experiment. This process of reform is now progressing far beyond the limits which had originally been envisioned. We deliberately carried it through a difficult trial because there was no other way out. But we think that not only our society and our country but also the entire world needs to understand this point. I say this because the cause of mankind is one and inseparable. The Soviet Union is turning into a more open society. We do not intend to cover up our problems.

[Shimizu] As you have heard, Mr Yakovlev, while admitting that the Soviet Union internally is experiencing many difficulties in carrying out perestroyka, repeatedly emphasized that the success or failure of perestroyka is not simply a domestic affair of the Soviet Union but it will have an international impact.

[Hirano] Now, Mr Shimizu, as an extention of such thinking, we become concerned about where the Japan-USSR relations and the northern territories question will head.

[Shimizu] Yes, there was a question on that point. But actually before going into the question-and-answer session, there was a reqeust from Mr Yakovlev's side.

[Yakovlev] I will take questions, but I would like to start by responding to a second question. I am already well aware of your first question, and since I have replied to

that first question many, many times, I would like you to start with a second question.

[Shimizu] This was said half in jest. At the end, asked to elaborate on remarks he made at the meeting with Liberal Democratic Party General Secretary Ozawa the day before yesterday, in which he was reported to have spoken about a third way for improvement of Japan-USSR relations, he replied as follows:

[Yakovlev] I am well aware of Japan's standpoint on the issue. Over the period of almost 45 years—over that period of time, we think the Japanese should have been able to know the Soviet stand on this issue. It has been a long time and also full of complications. Now a meeting of the Foreign Ministry-level work committee of the two countries is going on. The present situation when there is no peace treaty between the two powers, in other words between the Soviet Union and Japan, is not normal, and can indeed be said to be abnormal. This constructive dialogue being carried out at the Foreign Ministry level is that third way. As said in the Orient, one cannot clap with only one hand.

[Shimizu] The Japanese-Soviet work group referred to in his remarks is the existing working-level consultative body set up to discuss a peace treaty, where discussions on issues, including the territories question, are in progress at present. To hear him speak about clapping hands, apparently a reference to a third way, Mr Yakovlev did not really mean a dramatic move but only indicated a desire to solve the territories question through steady and patient dialogue.

Yakovlev Urges Economic, Political Ties

OW1511132989 Tokyo KYODO in English 1305 GMT 15 Nov 89

[Text] Tokyo, Nov. 15 KYODO—Soviet Communist Party Politburo member Aleksandr Yakovlev suggested Wednesday that Japan should change its policy of separating economics and politics in relations with the Soviet Union.

Yakovlev, a top aide to Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev, dropped the suggestion when he met Eishiro Saito, chairman of the powerful Federation of Economic Organizations (Keidanren), and other officials of the organization, Keidanren officials said.

The officials quoted Yakovlev as saying Tokyo needs to review how it benefits from the firm linkage of economics and politics.

Yakovlev was apparently referring to Japanese-Soviet joint projects in Siberia, now stalled due to a dispute over "the northern territories," a group of small islands claimed by Japan but occupied by the Soviet Union since the end of World War II.

Stressing the need to conclude a peace treaty between the two countries, Saito indicated that the two should resolve the territorial dispute before working on such joint projects, the officials said.

Saito was quoted as telling Yakovlev that a prerequisite for entering joint projects is to establish mutual confidence and achieve stability in conditions surrounding the two nations.

Japan and the Soviet Union began long-stalled talks on the peace treaty earlier this year, but the territorial issue remains a major stumbling block.

Ryoichi Kawai, vice chairman of Keidanren, told Yakovlev that Japanese business circles hope to see expansion of Japan-Soviet economic relations, but pointed to the lack of industrial infrastructure in the Soviet Far East necessary to promote joint projects, the officials said.

The officials also quoted Kawai as saying such projects also require signing an agreement to protect Japanese investments.

Yakovlev stopped short of making a clear response, but expressed his intention of continuing economic reforms under "perestroyka (restructuring)," the officials said.

Yakovlev is now on a week-long visit here for talks with Japanese Government and business leaders.

Remarks on Europe Troop Withdrawal, Korea

LD1511204489 Moscow TASS in English 2013 GMT 15 Nov 89

[Text] Tokyo November 15 TASS—Politburo Member Aleksandr Yakovlev has described the current processes of democratisation in countries of Eastern Europe as a victory for common sense and socialism.

Answering questions at a press conference held in Tokyo's Japanese Newsmen's Club today, Yakovlev, who heads a Supreme Soviet delegation visiting Japan at the invitation of the Japanese Parliament, said: "We regard the processes now under way in some of the East-European countries as quite normal and healthy.

They are healthy because they represent positive, democratic development. They pose a threat to none, except, maybe, those countries which have yet to go through the process of democratisation in the future and I mean not only Eastern Europe.

I think that these processes impart an impulse to the democratic development in the whole world.

Yakovlev said that he personally "is surprised at some news commentators in the West, including in Japan, who describe the processes at work in the socialist countries as a collapse of socialism, a collapse of Soviet policy".

"This is strange thinking, old-fashioned thinking", he said, "thinking which proceeds from the possibility of winning a cold war. But if we are putting an end to the cold war, it means that our thinking and our approach

must also be different. Moving along the road of democracy is a victory for common sense, not a victory in war. As regards the supposed collapse of socialism, I would say this: The commentators appear to have in mind the collapse of that socialism which they have created in their own minds. I regard this as a victory for socialism."

Yakovlev described the use by any state of its military might in our time as an anachronism. He reminded journalists that back in 1985 Mikhail Gorbachev put forward the concept of a free social choice.

"We shall firmly follow this policy. And in this we also pin hopes on common sense of all other countries. This is a very serious matter. And now all have to demonstrate common sense. Either we shall take the road toward a free and democratic European home, or, if some interfere with these developments, we shall slip back, to the cold war. And so this will in fact be collapse and a general collapse".

Questioned how the Soviet side would react in the event of President Bush, whom Congresswoman Patricia Schroeder urged to declare during the summit with Gorbachev the withdrawal of the two countries' troops from the European Continent, actually makes this proposal, Yakovlev reminded the audience that the USSR has repeatedly advocated disbanding all military blocs, including NATO and the Warsaw Treaty.

"We favour withdrawal of all foreign troops from others' territories. If the matter comes up at the upcoming meeting it will not be the first conversation on this subject. I think that the congresswoman who made such a plea, selected the correct address".

Referring to the situation on the Korean Peninsula, Yakovlev favoured unification of Korea. We, he said, want the two parts of Korea to meet each other halfway in a sort of a confederation, a federation or in any other form which is up to them.

Our sole interest in the region lies in the presence of foreign troops, for this affects our security. As for the rest it is for the Koreans to decide.

Soviet-Japanese Ties 'Markedly Improved'

LD1111105789 Moscow TASS in English 1016 GMT 11 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 11 TASS—By TASS diplomatic correspondent:

An official visit to Japan by a USSR Supreme Soviet delegation to be led by Aleksandr Yakovlev, a people's deputy of the USSR, Politburo member and secretary of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee, will serve the development of contacts between the parliaments and relations between the two neighbouring states as a whole.

The delegation will visit Japan from November 12 to 18 at the invitation of the country's parliament.

Such a high level delegation will visit Japan at a time when the Soviet side has announced an intention of Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev to visit Japan in 1991.

Naturally, the Soviet parliamentary delegation's stay in Japan will become an important step in preparation for the Soviet president's visit.

Apart from contacts through parliamentary channels, the programme of the delegation's visit also includes an audience with Emperor Akihito, and meetings with the Japanese Prime Minister Toshiki Kaifu, Foreign Minister Taro Nakayama, with the leaders of the ruling Liberal Democratic Party and opposition parties and representatives of the business community.

A wide range of matters concerning bilateral relations as well as international problems of mutual concern are expected to be discussed during the meetings.

The Soviet delegation's visit to Japan has a number of peculiarities: This will be the first Soviet parliamentary delegation to visit Japan since 1984.

It is also important that the delegation of such level arrives in Japan at a time when perestroyka efforts are being made in the Soviet Union, the elections and Congress of USSR People's Deputies have been held, and a new Soviet parliament formed.

And, finally, the visit will be made in an atmosphere of growing positive tendencies in Soviet-Japanese relations. The beginning of the process was set by the bilateral talks during Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze's visit to Japan in December last year.

Since then Soviet-Japanese contacts have markedly intensified. There were three meetings of the two countries' foreign ministers, and a permanently functioning group on a peace treaty between the Soviet Union and Japan was set up and has been doing appropriate work.

The atmosphere in Soviet-Japanese relations has markedly improved and makes it possible to expect positive changes in bilateral relations, Soviet diplomatic circles believe.

More Work Said Required in Japan Ties

OW1611070689 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1000 GMT 15 Nov 89

[Dmitriyev commentary]

[Text] A Supreme Soviet delegation led by CPSU Politburo member Yakovlev is now visiting Japan. Moscow Radio commentator Dmitriyev writes:

Reports from Tokyo on the visit of the Supreme Soviet delegation give us grounds to believe that Soviet-Japanese relations have already entered a new, substantial phase. First, what is noteworthy is that talks between

the two sides have been conducted in an unprecedentedly friendly and constructive atmosphere. This indicates that both sides sincerely seek to improve relations.

Prime Minister Kaifu, during his meeting with the Soviet delegation, said that the Japanese Government attaches importance to improving relations with the USSR. Soviet delegation leader Yakovlev has appraised the Japanese attitude as constructive. The reason why the talks in Tokyo have been positive is that the Soviet delegation's visit is seen as the start of preparations for the prospective visit of the top Soviet leader in 1991. Naturally, both sides hope that the visit of the Soviet head of state will have favorable results. However, this can only be possible if meeting points can be found, as much as possible, in the positions of the USSR and Japan on various issues. A search for such meeting points seems to be in progress with the Supreme Soviet delegation's Japan visit. In that sense, a hopeful area is bilateral cooperation in resolving international issues.

On the surface, Soviet-Japan relations seem to follow the worldwide trend of warming up. This is true, and Politburo member Yakovlev has also pointed this out in Tokyo. On the other hand, there are quite a number of similarities in the overall Soviet and Japanese approaches to international problems. Both sides' appraisal and understanding of the ongoing processes in the world are similar, and views on specific issues, such as [words indistinct], have become closer. With regard to the overall approach, it is also possible to find formal meeting points. For instance, in his speech at the welcoming reception for the Soviet delegation, House of Councillors Speaker Tamura stated: The contemporary world is a world of interdependence. No country can exist without peace and friendship. In reply, Politburo member Yakovlev said in his speech: In the present interdependent world, for development, security and prosperity must be guaranteed for all countries.

In general, Japan's foreign policy perspective of "contributing to the world" coincides in reality with the Soviet "new thinking" on many points. I believe that this by itself creates the possibilities for cooperation in the international arena. Chairman Gorbachev's message, conveyed orally by Politburo member Yakovlev when he met with the emperor, called for such cooperation, for instance in the area of environmental protection. Of course, a big gap still exists between confirmation of compatible conceptual approaches and concrete cooperation in the international arena. This is more so when it comes to regional issues. The statements on cooperation at the regional level will probably be much more modest than that at the international level.

The complicated infrastructure of current relations, which is not necessarily conducive to relaxing tensions, is a big issue. Nevertheless, this is true also for all bilateral issues between Japan and the USSR. However, bilateral relations between the Soviet Union and Japan, irrespective of the wishes of any third country, occupy an influential position in the overall political situation of Asia and the Pacific region. It will be beneficial for both countries to make use of such an objective position to improve the political situation.

In this sense, it is an encouraging sign that the Japanese Foreign Ministry recently agreed to discuss the relaxation of military and political tension in the Far East with the USSR. During such discussions, the peace proposals presented by Chairman Gorbachev in his speeches in Vladivostok and Krasnoyarsk will likely be taken up.

From the above, we can gather that it is a good thing that the USSR and Japan have come to realize their responsibilities for the regional situation and recognize the need to hold dialogues on such issues. The Japan visit of the Supreme Soviet delegation will promote such dialogues. As pointed out by the delegation during its meeting with Foreign Minister Nakayama, in order to give bilateral relations full expression and give full play to their role in the contemporary world, a lot of work remains to be done.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Rally Against U.S. Bases Held in Manila

HK1111035389 Moscow in Tagalog to the Philippines 1300 GMT 10 Nov 89

[Text] A huge demonstration calling for the dismantling of U.S. bases in the Philippines was held yesterday in front of the U.S. Embassy along Roxas Boulevard, Manila. Reports said that the demonstrators were demanding the immediate termination of a bilateral agreement signed in 1947 and due to expire in 1991.

The demonstrators also presented a petition to the U.S. Embassy stressing that it was time for Washington to dismantle its bases in the Philippines.

Aquino's U.S. Trip, Bases Issue Analyzed

HK1311044789 Moscow in Tagalog to the Philippines 1300 GMT 11 Nov 89

[Commentary by Anatoliy Aleksandrov]

[Text] During a speech at a dinner given in honor of Philippine President Corazon Aquino, President George Bush expressed the hope that the two countries would be able to sign a new agreement on the U.S. military bases. He tied this in with the issue of economic assistance to the Philippines.

These two matters dealing with the continuance of U.S. militarization were what should have been clearly discussed in Washington. The issue has to do with how succinctly the two parties can present their views governing their mutual relations. The Philippines' main aim is to obtain new investments. This is only natural in a country in which half its population is impoverished.

The country's foreign debt amounts to $28 billion. There are very high tariffs in the U.S. on Filipino products like sugar and textiles.

President Aquino has asked for assistance both from the U.S. Government and private business. Some results are certain, such as the signing of a memorandum covering the first part of a multinational aid program; $25 million will be held in reserve for the country's infrastructure. However, this is but a drop in the ocean, if one considers the country's real needs. In this regard, one should study closely the amount which the United States pays as rental for their military bases in the country. In 1990-1991, the final year of the lease, Manila will receive an amount close to a billion dollars. This meager sum, plus other monetary pledges, shows that the Washington adminstration's main aim, in its negotiations with the Philippines, is to ensure that the Pentagon's facilities remain in the archipelago.

It can be said that the Philippine Government's position is not an easy one. One should consider the views of the country's senators, the majority of whom oppose the retention of the military facilities since this violates the country's constitution, and is a threat to its sovereignty. As has been declared by Senator Wigberto Tanada, even if President Aquino supports a new agreement on the bases, the Senate will not approve it.

The future of the new agreement will be determined during the scheduled negotiations this December. Before this takes place, the promised economic assistance is being tied in with the future of the U.S. military bases in the country. This proves that the Pentagon has no intention of leaving the Philippines.

Aquino Trip Praised, U.S. Stand on Bases Hit

HK1411030089 Moscow in Tagalog to the Philippines 1300 GMT 13 Nov 89

[Text] President Corazon Aquino's recent trip to Canada and the United States was a success. This is according to initial reports in Manila, where the media praised the president for not tying herself down to the issue of the U.S. military bases in the Philippines.

According to the PHILIPPINE JOURNAL, President Aquino managed to fend off all the pressures exerted on her to influence the results of the upcoming negotiations on the military bases. The newspaper also reported that U.S. politicians were blatant in their aims, especially President George Bush, who declared that financial assistance for the Philippines depends on the outcome of the negotiations for the military bases agreement, which ends in 1991.

Meanwhile, Senator Leticia Ramos-Shahani, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, described this move by the United States as one displaying an utter lack of understanding of the current world situation. The present situation, according to Shahani, is one in which tension has been reduced because the Cold War has ended. She added that the military bases are no longer needed by the Philippines.

Near East

Afghan Deputy Minister Briefs Diplomats

LD1511203889 Moscow TASS in English 1900 GMT 15 Nov 89

[Text] Kabul November 15 TASS—The Geneva Agreements were fulfilled only partially over a period of one and a half years since the signing, Daud Kawian, deputy Afghan foreign minister, said at a news conference held here.

The Soviet Union withdrew its troops within the present dates and Afghanistan also fully complies with the spirit and the letter of the Geneva documents. But Pakistan and the United States grossly flout their obligations as parties to and guarantors of the agreements, he said.

Over a period of 18 months, Kawian said, the Afghan Government has handed over 920 notes of protest to the U.N. Good Offices Mission (UNGOMAP), citing over 7,000 Pakistani violations of the Geneva Accords.

There are 180 rebel training camps on Pakistani territory now, while the figure was 120 before the documents were signed.

According to the available data, as many as 12,000 mercenaries from some Arab and Western countries are now involved in the war against Afghanistan. The presence of rebel headquarters and the so-called transitional government in Pakistan is also a violation of the Geneva Accords.

After the Geneva Agreements were signed, the Pakistani Army started transporting weapons to rebel units, Kawian said. As many as 250 missile launchers, 115 long-range and 120 recoilless guns, 550 portable anti-aircraft missile complexes, about 30,000 machine-guns and 200,000 jet shells were transfered from Pakistan to Afghanistan from February 15 to August this year.

Up-to-date weapons supplied to the rebels include Stinger anti-aircraft missiles and Milan anti-tank missiles, SACR [as received] jet shells with a range of up to 60 kilometers and pellet shells. Through the hands of rebels Islamabad is waging an economic war against Afghanistan and delays the return home of Afghan refugees.

The Afghan leadership provided UNGOMAP with every assistance, Kawian said. But the Pakistani authorities are raising obstacles to the U.N. observers, preventing them from the "zone of free tribes" where opposition forces are massing. UNGOMAP posts in Pakistan are inefficient. They work only part-time, and weapons in large quantities can therefore be moved to Afghan territory.

The deputy Afghan foreign minister stressed the need to analyse the activities of the U.N. control mechanism.

U.S. Arms Aid Plans for Afghan Rebels Cited

PM1411141189 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 11 Nov 89 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Continuing Support for Mujahidin"]

[Text] New York, 10 Nov—The Bush Administration has notified the U.S. Congress of its intention to seek the allocation of approximately $280 million for the CIA to continue the program of weapons shipments to antigovernment formations in Afghanistan. THE WALL STREET JOURNAL reported this, citing information from intelligence sources.

The newspaper claims that the Administration's plans for military aid to the mujahidin are set out in a letter from CIA Director W. Webster to leading members of a Congress conference committee [soglasitelnaya kommissiya]. However, whereas this program hitherto enjoyed strong support among congressmen, following the Soviet troop withdrawal from Afghanistan demands have begun to be heard increasingly insistently on Capitol Hill for U.S. policy toward that country to be reviewed.

C. Pell, the very influential chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, criticized the White House position on this question. The report he has prepared indicates that the administration is "laying too great a stress on achieving an unlikely military victory and is spending too little time engaged in seeking a political formula for ending hostilities." THE WALL STREET JOURNAL pointed out that this opinion is also shared by other influential congressmen from the Democratic Party.

According to THE NEW YORK TIMES, during the fiscal year which has just ended the United States gave the Afghan mujahidin military aid totaling approximately $600 million. Washington keeps the precise figures for this aid a deep secret, but specialists believe that the United States has spent more than $2.8 billion over the past 9 years on arming antigovernment formations in Afghanistan.

'Arafat Interview Marks Palestinian Anniversary

PM1511123889 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Nov 89 Second Edition p 6

[Report on interview with Yasir 'Arafat, chairman of the PLO Executive Committee and president of the Palestinian State, by own correspondent S. Filatov in Tunis: "Yasir 'Arafat: 'Winning Freedom'"—date of interview not stated]

[Text] Tunis, 14 Nov—A noteworthy event took place on 15 November last year: The National Council of Palestine—the parliament in exile—ceremonially proclaimed the creation of an independent Palestinian state. The PLO headquarters is located here in Tunis. It was from there that the telephone call was made at around 0100 hours inviting me to an interview with Yasir 'Arafat, chairman of the PLO Executive Committee and president of the Palestinian state. A short time later I arrived. Despite the lateness of the hour, Y. 'Arafat was sitting at a desk in his office, looking through numerous papers. When I appeared he put them on one side and invited me to converse.

"How do you assess the situation in the Near East since the proclamation of the independent Palestinian state?"—that was my first question.

"A very important step has been taken in the direction of a just and comprehensive political settlement, which is very important in international terms," Y. 'Arafat began. "The Near East is a strategic region. Everything that happens here, whether positive or negative, has a direct or indirect effect on the whole world. That is why the proclamation of an independent state is one of the main initiatives undertaken by the Palestinians for the sake of establishing lasting peace in the region.

"It must be noted that this step had the full support of the Arab summit conference in Casablanca, the OAU session in Addis Ababa, and the nonaligned conference in Belgrade. We should remember the Madrid EEC declaration and the weighty statement made by the socialist countries in Budapest, Japan's new stance, and the continuing firm support of the PRC. Let me also remind you of the resolutions adopted at the UN General Assembly session on convening an international conference on the Near East under UN auspices with the participation of the five permanent members of the Security Council and all the parties involved in the Near East conflict, including Israel and the PLO.

"I wish," Y. 'Arafat stated, "to highlight the position of the friendly Soviet Union with regard to the just Palestinian cause and the support given to us by Comrade Gorbachev. Close contacts have developed between the Soviet leadership and the PLO at various levels.

"At the same time there is an escalation of hostilities in the occupied territories on Israel's part, and weapons are being used against our children, women, and old people, against our people. In the 23 months of the intifadah [uprising] about 1,000 Palestinians have been killed, 48,000 injured, and 6,500 crippled. Nearly 5,000 pregnant women have had miscarriages because of the use of chemical weapons. More than 64,000 fighters against the Israeli occupation are now being held in concentration camps or under administrative arrest.

"But despite all Tel Aviv's intrigues," the Palestinian leader went on, "the recent session of the PLO central council in Baghdad adopted a decision on the commencement of dialogue with Israel under international auspices in order to advance peace initiatives. I must say that we agree with Comrade Shevardnadze's proposal on

organizing a meeting of representatives of the PLO and Israel in Moscow, and are prepared to make efforts to this end."

[Filatov] "What effect did the proclamation of an independent state have on the Palestinian people?"

['Arafat] "The proclamation of independence inspires every Palestinian—man, woman, and child—to continue our long and thorny path, the path to win freedom and be masters in our own land. To live like the other peoples of the world. We have every right to that."

Touching on the difficulties in the path of a peaceful settlement of the Near East problem, Y. 'Arafat said:

"Unfortunately, despite the broad international approval that was clearly expressed at the UN General Assembly session, where 140 countries resolutely condemned the occupying forces' crimes against our people and their policy of threats, to this day the Israeli administration is refusing to accept our peace initiatives. That is why the European press calls I. Shamir 'Mr No.' He says 'no' to the PLO, 'no' to the Palestinian independent state, 'no' to self-determination, 'no' to an international conference, and 'no' to international participation and monitoring.

"Give me just one example from history," Y. 'Arafat says, "of a warring party having the right to choose for itself the adversary's representatives with whom it will conduct talks (Israel now says that it can only agree to dialogue with the Palestinians on condition that the composition of the Palestinian delegation is approved by Israel—S.F.). This is contrary to elementary logic. All the same, we can see that alongside the upsurge in the activity of fanatical circles, the peace-loving camp is also gaining strength in Israel. And that is very important."

Moscow Meeting Marks Nehru Birth Centenary

PM1611143389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
14 Nov 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Great Son of India"]

[Text] A ceremonial meeting was held 13 November in Moscow to mark the 100th anniversary of the birth of Jawaharlal Nehru. The report by L.A. Voronin, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and the speeches by A.S. Gonsalves, Indian ambassador to the USSR, and S.N. Rerikh, artist and public figure, pointed out that in our time the historic significance of Nehru's multifaceted activity—as the leader of the Indian national movement—has been revealed even more fully.

Nehru's visit to the USSR in 1955, which established the good tradition of dialogue at summit level, was a memorable event for Soviet people. The meetings between M.S. Gorbachev and R. Gandhi play a special role in this connection, it was said at the meeting.

The meeting was attended by L.N. Zaykov, member of the Politburo, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and first secretary of Moscow City CPSU Committee; G. Pallayev, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet; and G.I. Marchuk, president of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

Gorbachev Writes Foreword to Nehru Anthology

PM1511094389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
13 Nov 89 Second Edition p5

[Reprint of M.S. Gorbachev foreword to jubilee anthology on the life and career of Jawaharlal Nehru under the heading "Great Son of the Indian People"]

[Text] Pondering the fate of mankind at the present crucial time, we frequently turn to the legacy left by the eminent minds of the past and seek advice from them that will help us to chart the right course in the complex labyrinth of today's multiform, multidimensional reality. Towering among them is the figure of Jawaharlal Nehru—that ardent patriot and architect of the new India, destined to lead this vast country of many faces along the path of independence and progress and along the path of becoming a modern power deservedly enjoying great authority among the world community.

Without Jawaharlal Nehru, the history of the 20th century would be incomplete. His name is spoken with respect not only in India and the Soviet Union but throughout the world. Nehru is revered as the leader of the Indian national liberation movement, but he is also dear to people on earth as a humanist and champion of the idea of creating a harmonious, democratic human order which he conceived of as being founded on "free cooperation between free peoples."

My own acquaintance with India is largely connected with Nehru's name. His books "Autobiography" and "Discovering India" have conveyed to us a living image of this great country—the custodian of the legacy of an ancient civilization, which turns its thoughts to the future of a great people that have enriched the world with their tireless quest for the ideals of good and whose wise love of peace has always presupposed a firm rejection of violence, injustice, and oppression.

As a thinker and politician, Nehru largely determined the shape of his time. He saw further and with greater clarity than many of his contemporaries. Nehru was characterized by his broad, extensive understanding of the world and his ability to rise above narrow national interests and act on the basis of principles consonant with those we now call the new political thinking. His thoughts on mankind as a single interconnected, interdependent whole are spiritually close to ours. "The world is now one in life and in death," Nehru said.

What an accurate, concise idea! How deeply Nehru managed to penetrate to the heart of the problems and dangers looming over mankind. Surely his words that any policy geared to the use of nuclear weapons as a

means of resolving international problems and conflicts goes against common sense and that no nation would survive in the event of a world conflict flaring up have relevance today? And his appeal to create a "climate of peace," renounce mutual recriminations and hostile propaganda, and replace them with contacts and talks in a spirit of tolerance and restraint? Surely he ranks with those searching in this direction today? Nehru's efforts to establish in international relations the five principles of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems—the "pancha shila"—fully accord with the tasks of modern-day international policy.

It was Nehru who initiated the first Asian conference in Delhi in 1947 and who was one of the main organizers of the Bandung Conference, which was a major landmark on the way to uniting the young liberated states of Asia and Africa in the struggle against imperialism, colonialism, and racism and for peace and social progress. As a convinced opponent of oppression, tyranny, and diktat in interstate relations, Nehru worked for genuine equal rights for all countries and for the complete eradication of the vestiges of colonial regimes.

Nehru was of exceptionally great significance in the development of the concept of the Nonaligned Movement. Under him India became one of the movement's recognized leaders.

The great daughter of the Indian people, Indira Gandhi, continued J. Nehru's work in all areas of domestic and foreign policy. She made an unforgettable contribution of international scale to the ideology and practice of her country's rebirth. Soviet people also highly value her prominent role in strengthening friendship and developing cooperation between our countries.

Today, when the problem of mankind's survival is facing us in all its magnitude, the close link between politics and morality has acquired priority importance. Ignoring this link could lead to a nuclear apocalypse and the destruction of civilization on earth. A sharpened understanding of this reality has led us and Indian Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi to see the need to draw up measures preventing such a catastrophic development of events. This is how the Delhi Declaration was born, which offers the world community a program for building a world free of nuclear weapons and violence. The core of this program is its recognition of human life as the supreme value in any policy and not just as a concept.

In the nuclear-space age, reliance on military strength is futile. The urgent demand of today is peace—not through strength but through reason, disarmament, and development. Quite a lot has been achieved in this direction recently.

When thinking and working in this direction, we naturally rely both on present-day realities and on past experience. In this respect an important place is held by Nehru, who believed that the accumulation of mass destruction weapons must dictate political restraint and that balance founded on strength and fear must be replaced by balance based on mutual trust and disarmament, primarily nuclear disarmament.

The deep mutual understanding between the Soviet Union and India on the main issues of today finds expression in the proximity or similarity of our peace initiatives. The program put forward by the Soviet Union for the total elimination of nuclear weapons by the year 2000 is consonant with the "Plan of Action To Establish a World Order Free of Nuclear Weapons and Violence" proposed by R. Gandhi. We derive a sense of satisfaction from the fact that the initiatives of other countries, the Nonaligned Movement, the members of the "Group of Six," and the most diverse states and broad social movements on different continents are in the same vein.

Nehru witnessed many important historical events. He always said that he was enormously influenced by the Great October Socialist Revolution and the work of V.I. Lenin, who he called "the greatest man of the age." "Studying Marx and Lenin," he wrote, "had an enormous impact on my awareness and helped me to see history and modern life in a new light."

A sincere friend of the Soviet Union, Nehru made a substantial contribution to the development and strengthening of Soviet-Indian friendship and cooperation. On his own personal initiative, diplomatic relations between our countries were established even before the proclamation of Indian independence. Memories of Nehru's friendly visits to the Soviet Union, which established the tradition of personal meetings and contacts between the two countries' leaders, are still alive in Soviet people's minds. This tradition is still successfully continued today, to the good of the Soviet and Indian peoples. Consolidated by the Treaty of Peace, Friendship, and Cooperation, our relations are an important factor of peace and stability in Asia and throughout the world.

This year has been declared Nehru year in India. His centenary will be broadly celebrated in the Soviet Union and, we hope, in other countries as well, because Jawaharlal Nehru and his ideas and work belong not only to India but to the whole of mankind.

East Europe

Roy Medvedev Views Changes in East Europe

AU1511124489 Rome ANSA in English 1209 GMT 15 Nov 89

[Text] (ANSA) Rome, November 15—There is no way, at this point, that Eastern Europe will turn back, according to Soviet deputy and former dissident Roy Medvedev, in an interview in today's issue of the Rome daily LA REPUBBLICA today.

"The earthquake is destined to spread," he said. "Now it is the turn of Bulgaria where the swiftness of the change

is awesome, but already on the waiting list is Czechoslovakia where the explosion will be extremely powerful. "A profound change in Prague is inevitable, the last bastion remains Romania," Medvedev affirmed.

In the interview, this historian of Stalinism also analyzed the amazing turn of events in the Eastern European countries, outlined the underlying motives for these changes, and advanced hypotheses as to what to expect next.

The conservative regimes in Eastern Europe, and especially in the German Democratic Republic, hung on to power thanks chiefly to their backing by the Soviet Union, the historian said. The moment that Kremlin Leader Mikhail Gorbachev gave concrete evidence that the USSR no longer wanted to interfere in the internal affairs of these countries, it was clear that perestroyka would find fertile soil in these lands as well, according to Medvedev.

Those parties that were in charge up until yesterday now have only two roads before them: either to take a stand against these changes and thus suffer a sharp defeat, or to take on the role of a loyal opposition, changing their very nature so as to move closer to social democratic forces, Medvedev continued.

The shift in the East has not yet given life to a political alternative there, however, Medvedev warned, adding that it was necessary to, in some way, create a new regime.

If the movements underway spread even more, the problem of the reunification of Germany will become inescapable, he said. Perhaps, one way to handle the problem would be to create some form of federation between the two countries, he opined.

In any case, it was possible to affirm that the USSR would lose its empire but it would also "live better", as if it had shed a huge burden, Medvedev went on. This did not mean that the USSR would lose its status as a superpower, however, he said. Should this process be carried out in the East, it would also end up lessening the U.S. presence in Europe, Medvedev insisted. Thus the very concept of power would change, be transformed, he said.

The historian saw the figure of Gorbachev as the one solid point of reference in this picture of the disintegregation of the empire. There were no other leaders in sight, either to the left or right, he said. "Radicals and conservative have no chiefs, have no apparatus," he claimed.

Can communism survive in one nation alone? He was asked.

"I do not believe that in the countries of Eastern Europe the communist idea will die. "What is in crisis is communism of the state," was the reply.

Poland's Mazowiecki To Visit USSR in November

LD1611112189 Moscow TASS in English 1100 GMT 16 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 16 TASS—Polish Prime Minister Tadeusz Mazowiecki will pay an official visit to the Soviet Union at the invitation of the Soviet Government on November 23-26, a Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman announced here today.

V.A. Medvedev Meets Visiting PZPR Official

PM1611090189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Nov 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Exchange of Opinions"]

[Text] On 10 November V.A. Medvedev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, met with S. Wiatr, secretary of the Polish United Workers Party [PZPR] Central Committee, who is on a working visit to the Soviet Union.

There was a thorough exchange of opinions on questions of further deepening and improving cooperation between the two fraternal parties, above all in the sphere of ideology.

A.S. Kapto, head of the CPSU Central Committee Ideological Department, participated in the talks.

On the same day S. Wiatr addressed teaching staff and students at the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences.

'Extremist' Demonstrations in Poland Hit

PM1411140189 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 14 Nov 89 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Extremist Outbursts"]

[Text] Warsaw, 13 Nov—Outbursts by a number of groupings with nationalist and extremist leanings contrasted sharply with the backdrop of festive celebrations, held in a calm atmosphere all over the country, to mark the 71st anniversary of the restoration of Poland's state independence. These groupings decided to take advantage of this anniversary to inflame anti-Soviet feelings and make groundless claims against the USSR.

TRYBUNA LUDU reports that a series of blatantly nationalist "extraparliamentary opposition" groupings like the "confederation of independent Poland," "fighting solidarity," the so-called liberal-democratic "independence" party, and the "federation of fighting youth" organized a street march in Szczecin on 11 November, with around 1,000 persons—mainly young people—taking part. They desecrated a monument in honor of the Soviet Army soldiers who brought Szczecin its freedom. Banners inscribed "Soviets Go Home" and "Scheduled for Demolition" were attached to the monument's base. A crowd of rampant youths on Lenin Square tore down

a sign bearing the name of the leader of the world proletariat and replaced it with a new one reading "Jozef Pilsudski Square."

Participants in a rally by the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier in Warsaw went even further. The rally heard a declaration by "extraparliamentary groupings" demanding the "withdrawal of Soviet troops from the occupied eastern Polish lands and from the territory of the Polish People's Republic" and the revision of the present state border. The extremists described Kaliningrad Oblast in the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic as a "neocolonial enclave" and demanded its "unconditional elimination in favor of Poland and Lithuania." At the same time, they expressed complete satisfaction with Poland's western border along the Odra and Nysa Rivers, perceiving it as "an act of historical justice and an immutable factor of European security."

TRYBUNA LUDU notes that outbursts by extremists in Szczecin and Gdansk gained no support and caused indignation among the public.

It is easy to imagine how these absurd demands to revise borders may be received in European capitals, GAZETA WYBORCZA, which is closely associated with "Solidarity," wrote about the declarations by nationalist groupings at the Warsaw rally. It ought to be borne in mind, therefore, that these are schemes by nothing more than tiny groups or individuals. People with wild ideas can be found in every country, GAZETA WYBORCZA notes.

One could agree with what GAZETA WYBORCZA says, had it not been for the fact that it is so eager to offer its pages to the aforementioned "people with wild ideas" of sundry hues within the framework of "political pluralism." One of them recently held forth in GAZETA WYBORCZA, speaking words to the effect that monuments to Soviet soldiers were supposedly erected in various cities in the country in order to "humiliate the Polish people." Nationalist and anti-Soviet feelings, egged on by a section of the Polish press, provide a breeding ground for irresponsible outbursts by extremists.

Correspondent Views Kohl Visit to Poland

LD1611071489 Moscow World Service in English 1210 GMT 15 Nov 89

[Text] The West German chancellor, Helmut Kohl, has ended a visit to Poland. Radio Moscow's Warsaw correspondent, Vladimir Mikhaylenko, reports:

[Announcer] Chancellor Kohl set foot on Polish soil saying we want accord and reconciliation between the German and Polish people, and he left with the same message. He said the favorable climate of the talks he had in Warsaw, mutual trust, and the joint statement he signed with Prime Minister Tadeusz Mazowiecki were important steps in relations between the two countries and peoples.

In the course of the visit, Chancellor Kohl repeatedly said he felt obliged to make his own contribution to reconciliation efforts. Last Sunday we saw a symbolic gesture—after a joint prayer for peace Chancellor Kohl and Prime Minister Mazowiecki shook hands and embraced.

Will all Poles be eager and able to do the same? The past war in which Chancellor Kohl said the Polish people had suffered enormous damage at Germany's hands, that war left deep scars in people's minds and they will take time to heal.

This is a rather painful element in Polish-West German relations. In that connection, it is important that both sides confirmed their commitment to the 1970 treaty which normalized bilateral relations and reaffirmed existing borders.

Observers have pointed to the favorable sign that both the governments have been searching for new ways of cooperation. The whole package of intergovernment agreements on cooperation in science, culture, technology, health service, and nature conservation signed during the visit is fresh evidence that both countries have the most serious intentions. Chancellor Kohl described the agreements as a timetable extending well into the future.

This is also true of the joint statement signed by Chancellor Kohl and Prime Minister Mazowiecki. It says that both sides see a Europe of peace and cooperation as their goal. The visit marked one more step towards a common European home.

Chancellor Kohl Cited on GDR Events

PM1411150789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Nov 89 Second Edition p 5

[Dispatch by own correspondent Ye. Grigoryev: "Considered Approach Necessary"]

[Text] Bonn, 11 Nov—Cutting short his visit to Poland, FRG Chancellor H. Kohl has returned to Bonn. An extraordinary cabinet session took place here today. This was caused by the events in the GDR. They are the focus of general attention in the FRG. Particular attention is being paid to the decision of the new GDR leadership to grant GDR citizens the right to travel freely anywhere abroad.

In numerous television interviews and conversations, GDR citizens, as a rule, say that they are not planning to stay in the West and that they do not intend to renounce the socialist values of their state. As the newspaper DIE WELT acknowledges today, the majority of inhabitants, having made use of the new freedom to travel, have returned to the GDR. It is also being reported that the flow of emigrants from the GDR through Czechoslovakia has decreased significantly. Some are returning home. Life is showing the timeliness and wisdom of the decision adopted in Berlin.

Although certain political forces are continuing to give various "pieces of advice" and categorical terms to the GDR, Bonn cannot fail to admit the seriousness of the program of renewal and reform. In this sense, the moment of truth has arrived for the FRG ruling circles, when their sober attitude, goodwill, and assurances that they are not planning to tell the GDR population what to do and how in their own state, are being tested.

Speaking at a press conference today, Federal Chancellor H. Kohl stated that the FRG Government supports the policy of reform begun by the GDR leadership and expresses its readiness to assist the GDR in the economic sphere. At this historically crucial time, Kohl noted, it is necessary for all Germans, both in the East and the West, to display a considered and prudent approach.

Kohl noted that the GDR people have the right to arrange their own future by themselves and they have no need of "lectures from either side."

He reported that he had a telephone conversation today with Egon Krenz, general secretary of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany Central Committee. During the conversation, an agreement was reached about their personal meeting in the very near future on GDR territory. Questions of mutual interest will be discussed during the talks.

The chancellor also noted that he has had telephone conversations with the heads of state and governments of three Western states—the United States, France, and Great Britain. According to him, they expressed satisfaction with the events taking place in the GDR.

GDR Citizens' Visits to W. Berlin Described

PM1511213589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Nov 89 Second Edition p 5

[Own correspondent S. Zyubanov dispatch: "Just To Take a Look..."]

[Text] West Berlin, 15 Nov—The GDR Council of Ministers just recently adopted a resolution on virtually free travel by the republic's citizens abroad. It will remain in force until the GDR People's Chamber adopts the relevant law.

Over the last few days, more than 2 million residents of the GDR and its capital have visited West Berlin, having obtained without any red tape visas for either single trips or multiple trips valid for 6 months.

West Berliners have seen nothing like it. This city's streets are jammed with "Trabant," "Wartburg," and "Lada" cars with GDR registrations. Traffic in the city center is at a standstill. Many young people are debating in the squares and parks. The topics of debate are the same everywhere: peaceful coexistence between East and West, renewal of socialism in the GDR, the prospects for building a common European home, and the two German states' place in it.

By nighttime, the flow of cars and people has turned back in the other direction, toward the GDR border.

Virtually all the "Sunday trippers," having strolled along the Kurfuerstendamm, the famous street of expensive stores brightly illuminated by advertisement lights, made their way back home.

Ever since the border opened, Senator for Social Affairs Ingrid Stamer told journalists, there has been a sharp drop in the number of persons wishing to take up permanent residence in West Berlin. Many young people, picking up their backpacks and cases from the 20 sports arenas where the Senat was forced to house the "refugees" owing to the shortage of vacant housing in the city, are making their way to the border checkpoints.

Many newspapers give prominence to material on this topic. They also publish replies to a question asked by correspondents time and again: Why don't you stay on for good in West Berlin?

"We never intended to stay, we only wanted to stroll along the Kurfuerstendamm and see things for ourselves. Just to have a look..."

This was the most typical answer. An elderly worker told correspondents: "Because my family, my home, and my work are in the GDR." A young couple, pushing a baby stroller, replied: "Because the GDR has better social protection for families and more kindergartens. And generally speaking, we believe in the incipient process of renewal in our republic."

And so, the Berlin "Wall," built during the "cold war" 28 years ago, is now for the first time, thanks to the GDR authorities' decision, no longer an obstacle to contacts between people in their thousands while remaining, as before, a fortified border. A further 7 gateways were opened in it a few days ago, in addition to the 14 existing checkpoints.

Commenting on these events, West Berlin Governing Mayor Walter Momper declared that this is in no way a question of "German reunification," as representatives of the Christian Democratic Union try to claim, but simply of "a German encounter."

Observer on GDR Developments, SED's Role

LD1511133789 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1035 GMT 15 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow, 15 Nov (TASS)—TASS political observer Aleksandr Kondrashov writes:

It can be said without exaggeration that each day currently being lived through by GDR citizens is equal to a year, or even a whole stage in the country's preceding political development. In a few weeks all the aspirations of the popular masses to reforms in the economy, political life, and ideology that had been maturing throughout the recent years have become a reality.

Maybe not a single European country has been through such a turbulent and impetuous process of renewal in the post war period. One wants involuntarily to compare it with a spring river that has broken the ice that had been holding it back. But despite the quantitative picture of this political high-water, everyone, both on the eastern and on the western side of the river, involuntarily asks the question: Will this unbounded energy be to the good or the detriment of itself and of those surrounding it?

A precise forecast can scarcely be given by anyone at the present time. But nevertheless it should be noted that the new leadership of the party and the country is demonstrating a capability to march at the head of the process of renewal, sensitively reacting to the needs of society. Moreover, in my view, the peak of greatest tension in the country has already passed. Having decided on a bold, and in many ways risky step—granting all GDR citizens the right of free travel to the West—the leadership of the Republic was not mistaken in showing complete trust in its citizens at such a crucial moment. Let us recall how many prophesies there were until recently saying that the removal of the Berlin Wall would lead to the "collapse of the GDR." Indeed, now, not only the wall, but also all the GDR's western borders are open. But East German territory has not become deserted. Morever, the exodus has slowed down and, as facts show, is being reversed. The number of people wishing to return to the GDR has already gone into the tens of thousands.

But, despite the avalanche of changes, everyone senses that this is just the beginning. The Socialist Unity Party of Germany [SED] and all the country's citizens are faced with a mass of affairs and tasks to improve the face of socialism in the country, to enhance economic efficiency, and to create a new political climate. It is natural to ask what the motive force behind subsequent transformations will be. They cannot be carried out at rallies and demonstrations. What is needed is purposeful political and organizational activity. The mistakes and errors of the former political and organizational activity, the mistakes and errors of the former leadership, the poor situation throughout the party, which has to a great extent lost the people's trust, have been stressed with all frankness at recent plenums of the SED Central Committee. But, at the same time, the SED has shown its strength and ability to interpret its tasks anew and to revitalize its activity creatively, through its specific deeds and decisions.

On the basis of the actual state of affairs, it is unlikely that a force could be found in the Republic, other than the SED, that could undertake the implementation of the tasks of such complexity and scope that life has brought about. Of course, it is a matter of a renewed party, freed from previous stagnant approaches. But, it seems to me that of everyone the SED leadership and the broad mass of communists are best and most acutely aware of this. The program of action and the decision to convene an extraordinary party congress, adopted at the 10th SED Central Committee plenum, convincingly demonstrate that the dynamic process of renewal in the country is completely characteristic of the party as well.

It can certainly also be said that the new approaches in the SED's policy are exerting a beneficial effect on the nature of its cooperation with other parties in the National Front. Despite their external differences there is no longer any antagonism in the SED's relations with the opposition movements and church circles, either. These new realities are of extraordinary importance, because only in an atmosphere of national accord is it possible for there to be real progress in the construction of a truly democratic socialist society.

Many organs of the Western press are painting a different picture of what is happening, and most importantly, of the future of the GDR. The writers are not being sparing with all sorts of forecasts, indicating a specific time-scale for the reunification of Germany, predicting the GDR's withdrawal from the socialist community and that it will join the EEC, and even stating that the collapse of the postwar territorial and political structure in Europe has already taken place. In my view, such forecasts lack the main thing: consideration of the political will of the GDR's people, who have firmly linked their destiny with socialism and with their friends and allies, which has been confirmed both in all recent statements by the GDR's leadership and in the results of public opinion surveys.

In the Soviet Union there is full support for the revolutionary process of renewal of socialism in the Republic, and confidence is expressed that this process will only contribute to the expansion and enrichment of our ties, and to the fuller development of the potential for cooperation. This attitude was substantially expressed by M.S. Gorbachev in the words he addressed to the GDR citizens during his recent meeting with Egon Krenz: "Ater you yourselves, it is probably our people who most wish you well and every success."

GDR's Krenz on Coming Talks With Kohl

LD1411142689 Moscow TASS in English 1350 GMT 14 Nov 89

[Text] Bonn November 14 TASS—By TASS correspondent Lev Volnukhin:

Egon Krenz, president of the GDR State Council and leader of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, dwelt on relations between the German Democratic Republic and West Germany in an interview with the West German newspaper BILD. He noted, specifically, that the German Democratic Republic favoured cooperation between the two German states in economy and ecology. Krenz said he would discuss these and other problems during his forthcoming meeting with the West German chancellor Helmut Kohl.

The GDR leader denied reports that have appeared in some West German newspapers that he intended to raise the question of aid to the GDR, which would resemble the "Marshall Plan."

We have reached agreement with the chancellor," he noted, "that our representatives would draw up the agenda for the forthcoming talks. We have not discussed any Marshall plan or other aid programmes."

"I intend to tackle with Helmut Kohl realistic and reasonable problems, proceeding from the premise that there are two independent sovereign German states."

Asked about the future of the Berlin Wall, Egon Krenz stressed: "We have made our border with the FRG more negotiable. But this does not mean that the border will disappear. It is a border between two military and economic systems. And I think we are responsible for maintaining order on it."

GDR Communists' 10 Nov Rally Reported

PM1311144189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Nov 89 Second Edition pp 4-5

[Report by Own Correspondents S. Baygarov and M. Podklyuchnikov: "GDR Communists' Program"]

[Text] Berlin, 11 Nov—A rally of 150,000 people was held on Lustgarten Square in the center of Berlin yesterday after the 10th Socialist Unity Party of Germany [SED] Central Committee plenum had finished work. The rally showed that the GDR's communists are a political force equipped with a specific action program. The many banners carried slogans expressing the things that trouble party members nowadays: "SED—socialism, honesty, and democracy," "No sellout of the GDR!" "We are the party!" "Do not stand aside—take part in the struggle!" and "The only privilege is to work well for the good of the people!"

A succession of speakers took the podium at the rally—a party veteran who had experienced the grim schooling of antifascist struggle, a young girl who is only just preparing to become a candidate member of the SED, a foreman from Berlin's Bergmann-Borsig plant, and a scientific worker. There were party members armed with the rich combat traditions of Thaelmannite communists, courageous antifascists, and those who raised the country from the postwar ruins and transformed it into a bulwark of socialism and peace on German soil in the homeland of Marx and Engels.

The GDR is going through a tense and complex time. Events follow one after the other—demonstrations, rallies, and meetings where the dialogue centers on the kind of path that the country is to take in its further development. The present avalanche of political events was triggered by the migration to the FRG of a large number of GDR citizens, a considerable part of whom chose an illegal path for that. This prompted different strata in society to direct attention to the processes which have come to a head in the country's life over a number of years and aroused the population's discontent. A crisis situation materialized affecting the political, economic, social, and cultural spheres.

At the plenum, Central Committee members spoke with anguish about the fact that the country's previous leadership had failed to realize how urgent the changes were. It had remained aloof from the Soviet Union's experience, watching with suspicion the processes of renewal in the USSR and arrogantly believing that the GDR has no need of such changes. Even the words "perestroyka" and "glasnost" were deemed unacceptable.

The majority of the participants in the rallies and demonstrations in recent weeks in Berlin and many other cities advocated that socialism in the GDR be cleansed of distortions and that it face the people and become more attractive. There is another obvious fact, however: Among the demonstrators there were also opponents of socialism who put forward slogans defaming the GDR and the SED and calling into question the communist party's leading role.

In this complex situation uncertainty and vacillation began to appear in party ranks. Some 66,000 people have handed in their party cards. At the same time, however, 36,000 people have joined the SED, realizing how necessary it is to strengthen its ranks at this time.

An urgent and difficult task now faces the party: To seriously analyze the factors which have led to crisis phenomena in the country's life and to achieve change after embarking on the renewal of the SED and of socialism.

Against this background the great importance of the 10th Central Committee plenum is particularly well understood. In 3 days of intensive work it did what communists expected and demanded of it: It revealed the basic causes of the present difficult situation and outlined the party's action program. The composition of the SED Central Committee Politburo and Secretariat has been considerably renewed. Incidentally, heeding the opinion of local party organizations, the plenum has made changes to the Central Committee Politburo and Secretariat elected on the first day of its work.

It has been decided to hold the fourth party conference in mid-December. It will give fuller answers to the questions troubling the GDR's working people and clarify the course of renewal.

When discussing the current situation which has come about, the republic's communists stress that during the years of the socialist German state's existence its people have achieved major and truly historic successes. The country has a developed industry and efficient agriculture. The living standard in the GDR is rightly considered the highest among the socialist countries. The republic enjoys considerable international prestige based on its consistent policy of peace and goodneighborliness. These achievements cannot be nullified.

What are the reasons for the prevailing situation in the GDR which caused some of the plenum participants to say with alarm that it is essentially the fate of socialism in the country that is at issue?

First of all the plenum participants drew attention to the defective style of work which had appeared among the party's former leadership in recent years. This was characterized by a loss of contact with the masses, an unwillingness to take account of the real situation, the violation of the principle of collective leadership, and subjectivism. And that led to serious distortions in the country's life.

All this has had particularly grave consequences in the economic sphere above all. The plenum participants' speeches showed how the necessary proportions in the development of the national economy had been disrupted. In recent years plans were constantly put out of balance. Several times a year they were adjusted downward and then... bonuses were paid for "overfulfilling" them.

Attempts to rectify the situation were either rejected by the former SED leadership, which considered itself infallible, or were half-hearted in character and did not achieve the necessary results. The situation in the economy continued to deteriorate. The population noticed that especially from the fact that the range of consumer goods was reduced, shortages increased, prices rose covertly, and the symptoms of inflation appeared.

Various informal organizations made their presence felt in different parts of the country. The greatest renown among them has been won by New Forum, whose stated aim is to renew socialism and monitor the authorities' actions.

In the conditions of crisis other GDR political parties belonging to the democratic bloc became noticeably more active in their work.

The SED's action program adopted at the 10th plenum is of particularly great significance in the GDR's life. The party now has in its hands a compass showing the way ahead and helping to consolidate its ranks. The SED's capacity for active work among the masses is being revived.

The program addresses the main questions currently the subject of stormy debates in the country and a frank dialogue is developing between the party and the people and other political and social organizations. In that dialogue the current situation is being soberly and realistically assessed.

In order to meet its lofty purpose in socialist society, this document notes, the SED—the Marxist-Leninist party of the working class—must regain confidence in its own strength and elaborate a concept of modern socialism. This requires radical reforms. They must serve the workers, peasants, intelligentsia, and all other working people. The aim is to expand democracy and give socialism in the GDR a new dynamism.

The program contains concrete proposals on the reform of the political system and the creation of a socialist rule-of-law state and talks about the provision of broad information to the population and press freedom. An economic reform is planned. Changes are envisaged in the sphere of culture and art, science, and education.

Yesterday's rally at the Lustgarten demonstrated that the party support the 10th plenum's decisions.

"The main thing now," Egon Krenz, general secretary of the SED Central Committee and chairman of the GDR State Council, told us after the rally, "is that every party member should see in this program a guidance for action and implement it in practical deeds for the good of the whole people."

PRAVDA Reports SED Personnel Changes

PM1411111989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Nov 89 Second Edition p 6

[TASS report: "Work Concluded"]

[Text] Berlin, 10 Nov—The 10th Socialist Unity Party of Germany [SED] Central Committee Plenum concluded its work here today after 3 days. An information report points out that the resignation of the former Politburo, which bears full responsibility for the situation that has been created in the country, was announced there. The new Politburo and Central Committee Secretariat were elected.

The decisions of SED Bezirk [area] organizations and their objections to certain newly elected Politburo members and candidate members were made public during the discussion. After examining them, a proposal was adopted to release H.-J. Boehme, J. Chemnitzer, W. Walde, and I. Lange from their duties.

The Central Committee approved E. Krenz in the post of SED Central Committee general secretary.

The SED Central Committee Politburo includes H. Kessler, E. Krenz, S. Lorenz, H. Modrow, W. Rauchfuss, W. Herger, G. Schabowski, G. Schuerer, W. Eberlein, and W. Jarowinsky. H.-J. Willerding, G. Sieber, and M. Mueller became candidate members of the Politburo, and E. Krenz, H.-J. Willerding, H. Semmelmann, G. Sieber, S. Lorenz, W. Rauchfuss, W. Herger, and G. Schabowski secretaries of the Central Committee.

K. Hoepcke was elected chairman of the Commission for Culture Questions under the SED Central Committee Politburo, and G. Schirmer chairman of the Commission for Science and Education Questions under the SED Central Committee Politburo. They will both participate permanently in sessions of the SED Politburo and Central Committee Secretariat.

A decision was adopted to recommend that the SED faction in the GDR People's Chamber propose H. Modrow's candidacy for the post of chairman of the GDR Council of Ministers when forming the Government.

In accordance with the SED Statutes, G. Mittag was expelled from the Central Committee for very flagrant violations of internal party democracy and party and state discipline and for damaging the party's prestige. J. Herrmann was also removed from the Central Committee.

The SED Central Committee entrusted the Central Party Control Commission with examining G. Mittag's conduct and mistakes and taking appropriate measures in respect to other communists who have violated the party statutes.

The SED Central Committee entrusted the Politburo with forming a commission to investigate the causes of, and to ascertain personal responsibility for, the present economic situation in the GDR.

E. Krenz substantiated the draft SED action program, which was proposed for discussion. His report and the party's action program were adopted as the basis for preparing the Fourth Party Conference scheduled for 15-17 December this year.

West Europe

Gorbachev Greets Turkey's Ozal on Election

LD1611095289 Moscow TASS in English 0849 GMT 16 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 16 TASS—Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev sent congratulations to President Turgut Ozal of Turkey on his re-election.

Gorbachev expressed certainty that the fruitful and beneficial cooperation between the Soviet Union and Turkey will continue to expand on the basis of good-neighborliness, new political thinking and constructive dialogue.

In his reply, Turgut Ozal thanked Mikhail Gorbachev for his congratulations, sharing Gorbachev's vision that the further development of Soviet-Turkish relations will serve to promote peace in the region, Europe and the entire world.

Gorbachev Meets Dumas, Notes Changes in Europe

LD1411203389 Moscow TASS in English 2003 GMT 14 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 14 TASS—Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev today received French Foreign Minister Roland Dumas who was on an official visit here.

Soviet-French cooperation was highly appraised as the contents of the current important stage of European and world development.

A summit dialogue between the USSR and France has become a permanent and irreplaceable factor of an international scope.

A high degree of accord reached during the meeting between Gorbachev and Mitterrand in Paris last summer was confirmed on key questions of the present.

Gorbachev shared his thought among the main tendencies in East- West relations in the European process, in the socialist world.

"We have been at crossroads quite recently," he said. "What road the world will take: to the further confrontation, aggravation of ideological struggle, heightening of war danger, or along the road of cooperation, mutual understanding and quest of accord? It seems the choice has been made. The task at present is to develop progress to a new, peaceful period in a calm and considered way."

Emphasis has been placed on inter-relationship of domestic and international processes in both parts of Europe. As regards changes in East-European countries and in the ussr, they are very different for the conditions in which they started, economic possibilities, the level of political culture, historic heritage, etc. But they have the common tendency which favours the construction of a European home for it brings the countries closer, makes them more open and creates new opportunities for communication and equal exchange.

It was noted with satisfaction that responsible politicians are aware of the seriousness and positive meaning of changes that impart greater stability to mutual security.

Nevertheless, a balanced, constructive, in short adequate conduct is ever more important in connection with events in different countries.

The Helsinki process develops in its specific contemporary forms. And it will be very dangerous if someone tries, even if in a separate link, to return to what has already been the past stage of the process. This would mean to undermine it as a whole.

The depth and importance of changes dictate the need to step up the efforts, to meet each other halfway from the West and from the East. Both sides will be enriched by this reciprocal striving.

It is not time to destroy the established international political and economic institutions.

Let them transform themselves with taking into account internal processes, let them find themselves a niche in the new situation and interact.

It is useless to clamour about victory in the cold war, about the disintegration of some or other social system. Everything should be analysed realistically and interests should be balanced. When accusations of "exporting revolutions" are replaced with calls for "exporting capitalism," we have at hand a dangerous manifestation of old thinking.

It is time to show consideration for the fact that the world today does not consist of two mutually exclusive civilisations. It is one common civilisation in which human values and the freedom of choice have the primacy.

There exists a useful experience in solving most diverse problems in various societies. And the skill of contemporary politics is in using it to one's own and common benefit.

In our dynamic age there is a need for an intensive dialogue, Soviet-French dialogue, in particular, Gorbachev said. Therefore the question about a new meeting with the French president is quite timely.

The conversation was rich in substance and width of problems raised, which is characteristic of Soviet-French dialogue. Eduard Shevardnadze, Ambassadors Yakov Ryabov and Jean-Marie Merillion, and director of the Political Department of the French Foreign Ministry Bertrand Dufourcq were present.

Mitterrand Summit Call, E. Europe Link Noted

PM1511165789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 4

[Report by own correspondent Yu. Kovalenko: "Extraordinary Summit Conference"]

[Text] Paris—French President F. Mitterrand has invited the state and government heads of the 12 members of the European Community and EC Commission Chairman Jacques Delors to a meeting in the Elysee Palace Saturday. A brief official communique says that its participants will consider "recent events relating to the situation in Europe."

Judging by recent statements, the EC intends to give real assistance to the socialist countries. "The EC cannot be developed without thinking about links with the East," President Mitterrand declared. A number of concrete proposals has been put forward concerning the granting of credits, financing major projects, and rendering technical assistance. Paris has announced that the French head of state will pay an official visit to the GDR in the very near future.

Some observers link the convening of a conference of the 12 with the upcoming meeting between M.S. Gorbachev and G. Bush in Malta.

Potapov Views French Foreign Minister's Visit

LD1611071189 Moscow World Service in English 1210 GMT 15 Nov 89

[Text] The French Foreign Minister, Roland Dumas, has spent 2 days on an official visit to the Soviet Union. Analyzing the results of the visit, our commentator, Anatoliy Potapov, who spent many years as a Radio Moscow correspondent in Paris, writes the following:

The intensity of Soviet-French contacts is very high. This was the eighth meeting of the foreign ministers of the two countries this year. Last summer, Mikhail Gorbachev paid a visit to France. In 1990, President Mitterrand will visit the Soviet Union. An exchange of visits by the prime ministers is being discussed.

Quite naturally, special attention at the 2-day talks in Moscow was paid to political, social, and economic changes in the East European countries. Understandably, the French foreign affairs minister was eager to know the view of the Soviet side. The point is that on Saturday, President Mitterrand, as the chairman of the European Economic Community, is calling an emergency summit of the EEC. Judging by reports in the foreign press, it's clear that for many leaders in the West, the depth and the speed of the processes taking place in Eastern Europe were unexpected.

The answer of the Soviet side was clear. The changes in Eastern Europe are conducive to building a common European home, to draw countries closer together in an open manner and create new possibilities for human contacts and equal exchanges. Moscow makes a reminder in this connection of the core of European security which is inviolability of the territorial structure on the continent. That is, the basis for a realistic appraisal of the processes by the USSR are the Helsinki Accords of 1975.

Both sides have admitted that the Moscow meeting was favorable not only to the Soviet Union and France so as to develop cooperation between them, but for the whole of Europe. Roland Dumas made this point several times, Europe is in the center of all our talks.

I'm convinced, concludes our commentator Anatoliy Potapov, that by cooperating successfully on the international arena, France and the Soviet Union have produced quite a few concrete examples of bold ideas and joint efforts to promote the all-European process.

PCF's Marchais on Need for E. Europe Changes

PM1611103789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Nov 89 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Irreversible Changes"]

[Text] Paris, 13 Nov—The changes which are under way in the socialist countries represent an "irreversible process" of an ongoing nature. This was stated by George Marchais, secretary general of the French Communist Party [PCF] in a broadcast of the "Europe-1" radio station.

My confidence that events will take this course is based on the fact that the socialist society itself demands these transformations," he stressed. According to the words of the French Communist leader, the changes are a necessary precondition of the development of socialism.

Assessing the situation on the European continent, G. Marchais noted that the question of the elimination of

opposing military-political blocs is appearing on the agenda. As for the socialist countries, they favor the building of a common European home where cooperation, friendship between peoples, and disarmament would reign.

Italian Assembly Backs Gorbachev for Nobel Prize

LD1411212989 Moscow TASS in English 1649 GMT 14 Nov 89

[Text] Rome November 14 TASS—A member of the Italian parliament from the Christian Democratic Party [CDP] has urged the parliament to nominate Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev for the Nobel Peace Prize.

Bartolo Ciccardini, chief of a CDP department, said that both chambers of parliament "should have a thorough analysis of the strong impulse given by the Gorbachev policy to the process of peace and democratisation on an international scale."

He said the Nobel Prize nomination points to the recognition of the courage and political vision displayed by the Soviet president.

PCI Leader on Gorbachev's Coming Italy Visit

LD1611054989 Moscow TASS in English 1802 GMT 15 Nov 89'

[Text] Rome November 15 TASS—President Mikhail Gorbachev's forthcoming visit to Italy will be of enormous importance, especially from the viewpoint of the development of economic, technical and cultural cooperation between the USSR and Italy, Achille Occhetto, general secretary of the Italian Communist Party [PCI], told TASS.

A foreign policy must aim at a high level of cooperation which is quite important in our increasingly interdependent world. The need now is to understand the identity of the world's destinies at the present historical juncture. Cooperation is a new type of international relations, which will create an atmosphere of genuine trust and make interdependence a viable proposition of benefit to all.

Referring to the prospects for the relations between Italy and the USSR in the light of the Soviet leader's visit, Occhetto expressed confidence that the prospects will be positive. These prospects have a political nature and so may become an important stage in fostering international relations of a new type. Occhetto described this development as a major stage, for it opens up a concrete opportunity to engage in reciprocal exchanges in the economic, technical and cultural areas at a high level.

Considering the personality of Mr. Gorbachev and his charm, Occhetto said, which will doubtless impress the Italians, the visit will contribute to a more active stand by the Italian Government and people vis-a-vis the processes of rennovation and perestroyka.

Italian Communists believe that the huge efforts by Gorbachev to renovate his country cannot be implemented all alone, in isolation. These efforts need the support and a positive response on the part of Western states.

Based on this, Italian Communists call on the Italian Government to move more resolutely along the path of disarmament and decide for itself once and for all that today the problem of disarmament is our principal task. The Government also ought to give up its commitments and technological elaborations in the military field which are nothing but a waste of money.

It ought to contribute to economic development and in this way to the process of reforms and democratisation in the USSR. In this way Occhetto thinks, the visit will help create better conditions for Italy to take an even more dynamic stand on this issue, naturally taking account of the interests of the two military alliances.

The Communists are discussing all proposals within NATO's framework (the Italian Communists consider Italy's participation in this military alliance as indispensable), taking account of the reciprocal interest in arms reductions which have to be achieved in a balanced manner by the two sides.

On the upcoming Soviet-American unofficial summit to be held off the coast of Italy in Malta's territorial waters, Occhetto said Gorbachev's visit to Italy and the commitments the Italian Government may assume, may facilitate the meeting between the Soviet and U.S. leaders.

The summit is a bold follow-up on a series of meetings and a dialogue, creating a favourable atmosphere for peace and democracy in the world. Occhetto said he is convinced that the important process of renovation now under way, sometimes haphazardly, in the whole of Eastern Europe, calls for great resolve and control, in the first place on the part of two great powers as well as other nations.

This resolve must manifest itself above all in the approach to the major strategic problems. It is Occhetto's view that today's decreasing confrontation between the two blocs (and the process cannot be left uncontrolled for it is still a way of managing the world after the Second World War) has to yield place to a new plan for world organisation.

Occhetto said he wishes the meeting between Gorbachev and Bush, whose goals would probably be limited in scope, to become a point of departure for our planet to move on a new course.

Italy, the Italian Communist leader said, has key interests in the Mediterranean Sea. Resolving the most acute regional conflicts is a key to peace. The tragedy of the Palestinian people, one of the greatest national tragedies of today, is being enacted close to Italy.

So, the meeting between the leaders of the two great powers will contribute to an early settlement of the

regional conflicts, above all the one in the Mediterranean, for a peaceful Mediterranean Sea is a sine qua non of global peace.

It is only on this condition that the Palestinian people will be able to regain its country.

The Italians are waiting for Gorbachev's visit with great interest, the Italian Communist leader said in conclusion. He said he was happy to have a new opportunity to meet the Soviet leader. All their previous meetings were very important, with the two engaging in conversations on problems of interest to them.

Ryzhkov Receives Italian Cooperatives Delegation

PM1511111689 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Nov 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Talk With Italian Cooperative Representatives," on Ryzhkov's 14 November talk with the visiting Italian cooperative delegation]

[Text] Moscow November 14 TASS—Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov received representatives of the National League of Italian Cooperatives, led by A. Bagnato, member of the League's leadership, and D. Coffari, president of the League of Cooperatives of Ravenna, in the Kremlin today.

The Italian guests are in the Soviet Union to establish agroindustrial cooperation with interested Soviet organisations and farms.

The sides assessed positively the state and prospects of Soviet-Italian economic ties which are expected to be given a new impetus by the forthcoming visit to Italy of Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev. The Italian side came up with an integrated agroindustrial project of socioeconomic development of one of the districts in the Krasnodar Region, Southern Russia, on the basis of advanced experience in manufacturing, processing, and storing agricultural produce and delivering it to consumers.

Having noted all the merits of this complex project, Ryzhkov recommended that the National League of Italian Cooperatives should consider all organizational, economic, and financial issues that go with these projects with Soviet organizations which are ready to participate in it jointly with Italian cooperatives.

Taking part in the talk were USSR People's Deputy Yu.D. Chernichenko; Yu.A. Borisov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers State Commission for Foodstuffs and Purchases; and A.F. Kuyemzhiyev, chairman of Krasnodar Kray Agro-Industrial Union.

Italian Communists To Boycott Romanian Congress

PM1611101789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Italian Communist Party Decision"]

[Text] The Italian Communist Party [PCI] has refused to attend the 14th Romanian Communist Party Congress, which opens next Monday. A. Rubbi, member of the PCI leadership, visited the Romanian Embassy in Rome and informed the Romanian ambassador of this. The PCI Press Department made an announcement, which says, in part, that the repeated human rights violations in Romania make relations with this party amd its present leadership unacceptable.

Shevardnadze Interviewed on Nordic Issues

PM1511145589 Stockholm DAGENS NYHETER in Swedish 10 Nov 89 p 11

[Interview with USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze by Anders Steinvall: "The Swedish Model Interests Us"—first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] In connection with Foreign Minister Sten Andersson's visit to Moscow Friday and Saturday [10 and 11 November], DAGENS NYHETER's Moscow correspondent Anders Steinvall was given an opportunity to ask a number of written questions of Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze. His replies were also given in written form and for reasons of space have been shortened somewhat by DAGENS NYHETER's foreign editors in Stockholm.

DAGENS NYHETER: During his visit to Helsinki Mikhail Gorbachev spoke very positively about Nordic cooperation and also stressed the Soviet Union's desire to participate in this cooperation. What issues could be raised, and does this mean that the Soviet Union could envisage direct cooperation between Sweden and the Baltic republics, for example—and if so, in what fields?

Shevardnadze: This cooperation should of course take place primarily at the interstate level, that is, at the level of the union on the Soviet side. The field of activities is the broadest imaginable. To be honest, the possibilities contained in the Soviet federation have not been exploited sufficiently. In principle perestroyka has created completely new conditions for the development of foreign relations both for the Soviet Union as a whole and for its constituent republics, as it has for other territorial formations.

Even today they can cooperate fully within the framework of the federation with neighboring states and also other states in such fields as the economy, ecology, science and technology, and cultural exchange.

For example, we see no barrier to our republics' being represented abroad—as a way of achieving their sovereignty—by trade bureaus and engaging in cultural, scientific, and information exchanges. This also applies of course to the Baltic Soviet republics' relations with Sweden and the other Nordic countries.

As far as northern Europe is concerned, the most obvious and important direction for possible cooperation is the environment. The Soviet-Finnish declaration signed by

Mikhail Gorbachev and Mauno Koivisto mentions the environmental rebirth of the Baltic Sea as a common goal, and this is our joint response to the Swedish-Polish initiative.

The northwestern Soviet Union—that includes Leningrad and the Baltic republics, Karelia, Komi, and inland parts of Russia—has a favorable starting point as a cooperation partner in direct economic contacts. What we are talking about here is joint ventures, industrial cooperation, and joint long-term programs. Special zones for intensive economic cooperation can be created, as can large advanced technical plants.

The fields and forms for cooperation can be coordinated through contacts between representatives of the union Supreme Soviet and the republic supreme soviets in the Soviet Union and representatives of the Nordic Council. In making this proposal we take as our point of departure the Nordic Council's status as a distinctive organization not only aimed at preserving the Nordic community and cooperation among its member nations, but also open to cooperation with other countries.

DAGENS NYHETER: First: Could you describe how the Soviet Union's view of the Nordic area has developed or changed since Mikhail Gorbachev's Murmansk speech (in October 1987—DAGENS NYHETER editor's note) and describe the Soviet Union's view of the continued efforts to create a nuclear-free zone in northern Europe?

Second: Swedish observers have noted a considerable difference between the active policy of disarmament the Soviet Union is pursuing in central Europe and its cautiousness in northern Europe. How would you comment on that view?

Shevardnadze: There is no real foundation for portraying our disarmament policies in northern Europe and central Europe respectively as being in some way in opposition to each other. Our line on disarmament is a geographically and conceptually coherent entity. All other approaches, such as attempts to keep naval disarmament outside the negotiations, for example, are extremely risky. Our objective is, on the contrary, to reach a level of reasonable defense sufficiency in all areas of military activity—whether this applies to central, southern, or northern Europe.

The search for a formula for the security of the northern part of our continent has a long history. This fact has of course also had repercussions for the situation in northern Europe, where antagonisms have never been as great as in central and southern Europe.

Has the necessary account been taken in defense policy of this circumstance? My honest answer is: No, not always. The new thinking has meant adjustments to policy. In November 1987 the well-known Murmansk initiatives were put forward. We have also given practical confirmation of our political program by implementing unilateral reductions in the defense strength of the Soviet Union.

The Soviet units stationed in the northwestern region, that is, in the Leningrad and Baltic Military Districts, will have been cut by one-third by the end of 1990. This is proportionately more than the average cuts in our defense forces.

The question of a nuclear-free zone: We attach great importance to the creation of nuclear-free zones in various regions of the world and for our part are ready to contribute to their creation. In Murmansk Gorbachev reiterated our readiness to act as guarantor of a nuclear-free zone in northern Europe and to discuss with its future members measures—including particularly important measures—pertaining to the sections of Soviet territory bordering this region. We have actually already initiated such measures. In those areas bordering northern Europe there are no longer any permanently combat-ready Soviet short- and medium-range missiles.

Today our tactical nuclear arms are unable to reach the northern European countries from any point on Soviet territory. I would remind those who point to the possibility of redeploying these in border zones that we are proposing a "third zero option" for tactical nuclear arms (Their total abolition—DAGENS NYHETER editor's note).

There still remain the nuclear arms which are included in the armaments of the Soviet and NATO naval forces in the seas off the coasts of northern Europe. On this level, too, we are ready for far-reaching solutions. We have, for example, begun unilaterally to abolish certain sea-based nuclear arms in the Baltic Sea. We are ready to enter into agreements with all nuclear powers and the states around the Baltic on effective guarantees to give the Baltic Sea nuclear-free status.

Of course the Baltic Sea is not the only sea on the shores of northern Europe. It is clear that the whole question of nuclear arms at sea should be solved on a broader and more radical basis.

As far as reinforcing security in Europe is concerned, I would also remind you of our proposals in Murmansk on confidence-building measures and on restrictions on naval activity in the north. We also find Iceland's proposal attractive—arranging an international conference to prepare negotiations on naval disarmament in the north Atlantic.

DAGENS NYHETER: At the conference involving Swedish and Soviet economists held in Moscow recently the Soviet side showed great interest in the "Swedish model." Could you describe in a little more detail how the the Soviet Union views future bilateral cooperation with Sweden?

Shevardnadze: Sweden's experience—or, as it is put increasingly often these days, the "Swedish model"—has long interested us, today more than ever. Both at the theoretical and at the practical levels. We believe that the ideal social form in the third millenium will be characterized by a synthesis of all the positive lessons learned by mankind. In this context Sweden has much to offer. That was why we gladly accepted Prime Minister Carlsson's proposal for meetings between economic researchers and other specialists for the exchange of views on social and economic questions. Two such meetings have already taken place, in Stockholm and Moscow.

The principal topics for discussion were problems involved in the reorganization of taxation systems, the development of cooperatives, questions to do with ownership and price formation, and experience of national economic decisions—that is, problems that are particularly important at present for Soviet society.

We have achieved much in relations between us. But to be honest, economic and commercial relations are unsatisfactory. I think that it is time to start to implement energetically new types of commercial and economic ties and new methods of maintaining them. As long ago as 1987 Mikhail Gorbachev proposed in his speech in Murmansk the planning and implementation of international projects to exploit the natural resources of the Arctic, particularly those of the Kola Peninsula. We have also proposed that a joint energy program for northern Europe be worked out.

We must continue to search for new methods of working within the framework of joint ventures, industrial cooperation, direct contacts, and trade in ports and border regions. The fundamental laws affecting ownership, leasing, economic autonomy at republic and regional level and a whole range of other laws currently being prepared by the Supreme Soviet will make our economic system compatible with every conceivable sort of foreign property and capital.

Something has already been done in this direction. As far as I know people are now working to make it possible to cooperate with the Swedish companies Tetrapak, Johnson, Ikea, and Volvo. Joint ventures are already operating: Neptun, Neva, Europa-Hotell, Kiev-Tetra, and others. Supplies of natural gas to Sweden are planned.

In short, developments are in motion and they must be supported.

Latin America & Caribbean

Spokesman Denies Arms Supplied to El Salvador

LD1511175189 Moscow TASS in English 1715 GMT 15 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 15 TASS—"The Soviet Union has never supplied armaments to the Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front in El Salvador nor to any other rebel movements in Central American countries and is not doing so now," Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Yuriy Gremitskikh told a briefing here today.

"Moreover, striving to promote a settlement in the region, the Soviet Union has ceased supplying armaments to friendly Nicaragua. So now there are no Soviet arms supplies to Central America," he said.

Gremitskikh made this statement in connection with the fact that several U.S. officials had blamed the Soviet Union for the fact that the crisis in Salvador remains unsolved and alleged that the USSR delivers arms to rebels in El Salvador.

The Soviet diplomat said that the USSR, motivated by principles of humanism, urges the warring sides in El Salvador to show goodwill, put the supreme interests of preserving human lives above any political aspirations and calculations, cease hostilities and, as an initial step, return to the situation that existed prior to the current hostilities.

Then they should sit down at the negotiating table and continue the dialogue started in Mexico City and San Jose to achieve a political settlement of the conflict.

Gremitskikh said that the Salvadoran Government and the leadership of the Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front were informed of the Soviet Union's stand.

"We believe that all members of the international community, above all the states that traditionally have influence on the warring sides in El Salvador should help check hostilities. This will undoubtedly have a positive effect on the entire process of Central American settlement," the Foreign Ministry spokesman said.

Flareup of Fighting in El Salvador Noted

PM1511112589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 4

[M. Kozhukhov roundup: "El Salvador: War on the Capital's Streets"]

[Text] Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front [FMLN] detachments have conducted the largest military operation in the entire history of the Salvadoran conflict in the country's capital.

An offensive was launched simultaneously throughout the country's territory; however, San Salvador's city blocks, which were the scene of fierce fighting between FMLN detachments and government troops, were the epicenter of Sunday's events. The intense firefight involving artillery and helicopters lasted approximately 18 hours and encompassed virtually the entire capital, completely paralyzing life in the city. According to REUTER, attempts were made to storm President Alfredo Cristiani's official and personal residences; however, it is reported that the president was not hurt.

Reports of the losses on both sides are contradictory.

A state of siege has been introduced in El Salvador and constitutional guarantees have been suspended. A curfew is in force in the capital, and the international airport has been closed. According to President Cristiani, whose speech was broadcast on the radio, these steps are needed to "defend the population against left-wing terrorism." According to the president, the military are in complete control of the situation; however, it is reported from San Salvador that these words by A. Cristiani were heard on the airwaves accompanied by continual explosions and shooting.

International observers regard events in San Salvador in the context of the interrupted talks between the government and the insurgents. The third round of these talks should have been held recently in Caracas, but opposition representatives refused to take part in them after a left-wing trade union's headquarters was subjected to artillery bombardment resulting in the deaths of at least 10 people. According to the insurgents, the government decided on dialogue with them solely out of propaganda considerations, with no intention of reaching any agreement. Sunday's offensive was thus an attempt on their part to show themselves to be a force to be reckoned with.

In the opinion of observers, however, events in San Salvador practically rule out all hopes of success for future talks between the government and representatives of the insurgents. Moreover, the fighting in the Salvadoran capital, a REUTER correspondent believes, dealt the fragile peace settlement process in Central America a considerable blow.

Economic Reform Conference

Official on Economic Reform Conference Agenda

904A0052B Moscow EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA in Russian No 44 Oct 89 pp 4-5

[Report on interview with P. Katsura, first deputy secretary of the State Commission of the USSR Council of Ministers on Economic Reform by an EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA correspondent: "Radical Economic Reform: Immediate and Long-Range Measures"; date and place not specified]

[Text] After the publication of information in the previous issue of EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA on the All-Union Scientific-Practical Conference on Problems of Radical Economic Reform, and also the proposal for a conference by the organizational committee to discuss material on immediate and long-range measures to intensify economic reform, the editorial office began to get numerous questions about the periods and agenda of the work of the conference and requests for the publication of its materials on the pages of EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA. Taking the desires of our readers into account, the editorial office proposes to publish the basic theses of the reports and information. Part of them are printed in today's edition. As for questions on the agenda and conference periods, the editorial office has asked P. Katsura, first deputy chairman of the Commission of the USSR Council of Ministers on Economic Reform, to answer them.

[EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA] Petr Makarovich, first of all, what basic questions will be the subject of discussion at the conference? And who will conduct it?

[Katsura] Radical economic reform is the key element of perestroyka. Its fate in many ways will be decided today in the economic system. What road have we traveled since April 1985? What lessons can we derive? What should the program for our national development be in the near-term? What are the pluses and minuses of the various developmental variants—conservative, radical, and moderate-radical? What is the best way to coordinate the immediate and long-range measures? In what direction should there be additional work on the program for intensifying radical economic reform that has been prepared by the organizational committee of the conference.

These and other key questions for perestroyka have been submitted for discussion by the All-Union Scientific-Practical Conference on Problems of Radical Economic Reform. It is being conducted by the State Commission of the USSR Council of Ministers on Economic Reform, the USSR Academy of Sciences, and the Academy of the National Economy of the USSR Council of Ministers from 13 to 15 November. The organizational committee that is conducting it is headed by Academician L. Abalkin, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the State Committee of the USSR Council of Ministers on Economic Reform.

[EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA] What is the conference agenda?

[Katsura] It is proposed that a plenary session be held on the first and third days of the conference (conference location—Column Hall in the House of Unions). On the second day, the conference will be sectional. It is proposed that the plenary meetings hear speeches by N. Slyunkov, a member of the Politburo and a secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, by L. Abalkin (main speaker), who is deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, by managers of the economic departments of the country, by prominent economists, and by representatives of other social strata. Work will be organized at the conference in the following sections: The structure of property and the form of economic management (jointly with the Scientific Council of the AN SSSR [USSR Academy of Sciences] on Problems of Economic Calculation and Self-Financing, and the meeting place is the ANKh [Academy of the National Economy at the USSR Council of Ministers]; problems of territorial development and regional economic accountability (meeting place is the ANKh at the USSR Council of Ministers); the relationship of planned and market regulation: unity and contradiction (meeting place—TsEMI/Central Economic-Mathematical Institute of the AN USSR); organizational structures of management: search for optimal decisions (meeting place—Institute of the Economy of the AN USSR); the perestroyka of the finance-credit system (meeting place is the ANKh at the USSR Council of Ministers); labor relations and social policy (meeting place is the TsEMI of the AN USSR); fundamental restructuring of foreign economic activity (meeting place is the World Economics and International Relations Institute of the AN USSR); personnel for economic reform (meeting place is the ANKh of the USSR Council of Ministers). It is also proposed to conduct "roundtables": the interrelationship of policy and economics at the present stage of perestroyka; the experience of economic reorganizations abroad and the possibility of its use; the adoption of economic decisions and assessments of their socioeconomic consequences, and public opinion on perestroyka.

[EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA] Petr Makarovich, in the previous issue of EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA, other periods were indicated for the conference. What brought about the changes?

[Katsura] Well, it was initially planned to conduct a conference at the end of October and the beginning of November of this year. But on those days, sessions of the USSR Supreme Soviet will examine the plan and budget for 1990. Therefore, the organizational committee moved the conference to 13-15 November.

Abalkin Discusses Economic Theory, Practice

PM1511103589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
11 Nov 89 Second Edition pp 1, 4

[Interview with Academician L.I. Abalkin, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, by correspondent A. Nikitin under the rubric "Economic Science and Reform": "There Are No Simple Solutions"; date, place not given; first two paragraphs are PRAVDA introduction]

[Text] There is a growing need for critical interpretation of the lessons of perestroyka, for creative elaboration of the concept and policy of deepening the economic reform, and for more clear-cut definition of its stages. The All-Union Scientific and Practical Conference to be held in Moscow 13-15 November will be devoted to just these questions.

On the eve of this event the editorial board asked Academician L.I. Abalkin, chairman of the conference organizing committee, to speak about the most urgent problems of the development of economic science and about ways to implement the reform in our country.

[Nikitin] How do you, Leonid Ivanovich, evaluate the role of social science, and economic science above all, in elaborating the concept of our society's renewal and in preparing and implementing the economic reform?

[Abalkin] Historical experience indicates that the accumulation of theoretical groundwork always precedes a revolutionary renewal of society. Let us recall the great French Revolution, whose bicentennial was celebrated this year. It would have been inconceivable without the tremendous efforts of the outstanding enlighteners of the 18th century. And is this not indicated also by the example of another great revolution—the October Revolution?

The scientific foundations of the perestroyka begun by the party in April 1985 were also quite a long time maturing deep within the social sciences—probably over the previous 3 decades. They frequently matured in the form of a "heresy." Authors who contradicted official dogmas and canons (such has been the case in science before) were persecuted or "criticized." Nevertheless, it was possible in a short time to elaborate the quite harmonious concept of perestroyka. Precisely the concept—that is, the overall idea, goal, and strategic directions—and certainly not a plan drawn up in detail.

I believe that the art of political leadership consists in ascertaining progressive trends of social thought, relying on new ideas, developing them skillfully, and turning them into an action program.

[Nikitin] Could you name the new ideas that have become the theoretical base of perestroyka?

[Abalkin] It is easier for me to do this using the example of economic science. In addition to regurgitating truisms and offering apologias for established forms and conditions of management, embryos of new economic thinking have accumulated within it. Questions of the economy's transfer to an intensive footing, the development of the scientific and technical revolution, and a qualitatively new role for the services sphere have been worked out in quite great detail. The need for and the areas of the creation of a socialist market, the switch to wholesale trade in the means of production, credit reform, and the renewal of methods of plan management have been substantiated. There are also many theoretical developments in analyzing the problems of economic accountability and revealing the mechanism governing the dynamics and realization of socialist ownership. Science has approached in real earnest the idea of the diversity of forms of this ownership.

Unfortunately, far from all the said developments have become public knowledge. Many of them were produced behind closed doors or were known only to a narrow circle of specialists. But such is the fate not only of economic science...

[Nikitin] Excuse me, Leonid Ivanovich, but what is the use of economic science which is developed "behind closed doors"? It must be closely linked with life. And it is probably no coincidence that economic science, both in the past and today, is subjected to quite serious criticism. What can you reply to this?

[Abalkin] The peculiar "tradition" of shifting the blame for the state of affairs in the economy onto science dates from the stagnation period. Time has convinced me that this is not as harmless as it might seem at first glance. The "scapegoat" in the form of economic science is a social lightning conductor directing public opinion away from the search for more profound, fundamental causes of crisis phenomena.

I certainly do not intend to beautify the state of affairs in economic science. Despite its undoubted merits, it is greatly in arrears to society. Theoretical groundwork accumulated earlier soon melts like spring snow. The swift changes in life are outstripping the rate of increase in scientific knowledge. It is too early to speak of a breakthrough or a qualitatively new level of theoretical generalizations, although they are extremely necessary today.

In particular, I am very worried about the politicization of economic science. Sometimes it plays up to mass sentiments and is inclined to substitute fine phrases for serious and thoughtful analysis. I am sure that serving science, like serving the muses, does not tolerate vanity. We have frequently and rightly criticized economic science for timeserving and sycophancy. But is the opportunist approach not reemerging in a new form today as a relapse into an old disease?

[Nikitin] Readers have particularly many questions about the political economy of socialism. I recently met with 93-year-old economist L. Yaroshenko, a participant in the celebrated discussion with Stalin in 1951. (My

conversation with him was carried in PRAVDA 29 September this year). Incidentally, he believes that we have still not created the science of socialist political economy and that this should still be created. But it is also possible to hear the view that such a science does not exist at all and that there is no need for it. That the very concepts of socialism and capitalism have supposedly become obsolete and that it is simpler to replace them with a comparison of different economic models—administrative and market.

[Abalkin] Unfortunately, pragmatism has put down strong roots in the mass consciousness. It is fashionable to argue today that the person is not interested in the name of the society in which he lives. All that is important to him is that work should be well paid and that he should be able to buy everything he wants with the money he has earned. And this is passed off as a new thinking free from ideological blinders.

[Nikitin] But do we not oversimplify this very "person"?

[Abalkin] Of course, it is very important both to earn well (precisely to earn, and not "receive"!) and to be able to spend what has been earned. This is particularly obvious when there are empty counters. But is this really the meaning of life? Does man really live by bread alone? Never—either in the past or in the future—will man be indifferent to the sociopolitical conditions of his existence or the nature of the society in which he lives and which he will leave to his children.

Socialism is not an invention of armchair scientists and political schemers. The socialist choice has been achieved over centuries of agonizing searching by outstanding thinkers and reinforced by the revolutionary gusto of millions of working people. It has embodied the dream of a society in which there will be no social oppression, exploitation, or slavish dependence on the strong of this world. Of course, views on socialism do not remain unchanged. Notions of what it should look like are a function of time. We observe a similar development of notions in any branch of science.

Like any science, socialist political economy cannot be created in a single day. Still less before the object of its study has emerged: the constantly changing living fabric of new production relations woven from contradictory threads. And, like any other science, socialist political economy is characterized by discoveries and errors, by the stern verification of hypotheses by life, by the turning of obsolete views into dogmas, and by struggle among different schools and trends.

Socialist political economy must also be developed through the integration of scientific achievements. Marxist political economy emerged in the past as the godfather of all that was best that had been accumulated by economic thought. And that determined its strength. But caste exclusivity and isolation from new ideas have impoverished socialist political economy. Today it is faced with the difficult process of the renewal and revolutionary perestroyka of the methodology and the theoretical arsenal. The chief obstacles on this path are dogmatism, which has put down deep roots, the speculative construction of schemes, and the attempt to artificially impose them on practice.

[Nikitin] And what has life shown? What lessons has it taught?

[Abalkin] Every revolution begins by denying and distancing itself from the structures which took shape in the past. And only with time does it become clear that socialism not only denies what is old but also inherits all the best that has been accumulated by human civilization. And only by relying on this legacy and augmenting it does it become a natural stage of social progress. Incidentally, we still have to become aware of this special feature during the present revolutionary perestroyka and to combine the impulse for renewal with the preservation of all the assets of Soviet society. In other words, progress includes elements of not only denial but also continuity.

[Nikitin] Which elements specifically?

[Abalkin] In addition to material culture and technology, they include the traditions and experience of the democratic organization of society, humanist ideals and moral norms, and assets of spiritual culture. I should also include here forms of organizing economic life which have been worked out in the course of experience over many centuries, such as the market, cooperatives, banking institutions, the system of life and property insurance, and much besides.

Let us note that these forms have a common economic substance. They are not capitalist or socialist in themselves. However, on becoming the property of a particular social system, they always serve the predominant ownership relations and acquire a specific social nature.

[Nikitin] Is it not precisely the duality and the dialectical contradictoriness of the said forms that give rise to different—sometimes diametrically different—assessments of them?

[Abalkin] Yes. Hence the very acute debate and the intransigence of positions. Some people perceive the development of the market and joint-stock enterprises as the restoration of capitalist usages, while others ignore their specific social nature and gear themselves to the mechanical borrowing of readymade models. I believe that both are wrong and both are lacking in dialectics. For true science is distinguished from ordinary thinking precisely by its ability to view phenomena as a whole, to reveal their internal contradictions and consequences, and not be confined to judgments according to the "either—or" principle. Whatsoever is more cometh of evil.

And again. Life has shown that movement toward socialism is not confined to a certain group of countries. It is a worldwide trend. It proceeds in various directions

and assumes sometimes diverse forms. And the result is a real multiplicity of models of socialism.

[Nikitin] Do you mean the social democratic model of socialism, about which PRAVDA has already written?

[Abalkin] Yes, it too. It is increasingly obvious today that the worldwide trend of movement toward socialism embraces several directions, which do not rule out but enrich each other. This trend manifests itself in other forms too. A whole number of structures which have taken shape in the West are not distinguishing features of capitalism at all but, rather, "embryos" of new social relationships. I believe that such an understanding fully accords with the spirit of Marxist-Leninist theory.

This is why, when analyzing such global problems as the correlation between capitalism and socialism, we must not confine ourselves to simply comparing the potentials, levels, and results of the development of two or several countries.

[Nikitin] Your views are very interesting, although they are probably disputed by a number of scientists...

[Abalkin] Does anyone have a patent on the absolute truth? Where arguments end, scientific questing ends too....

[Nikitin] Leonid Ivanovich, you were a participant in the recent discussion among leading economists at the party's Central Committee. What can you say about it, and what impressions did it leave you with?

[Abalkin] The discussion showed the party leadership's profound concern at the state of affairs in the economy and its desire to compare its own assessments and the planned measures with the conclusions of economic science. It was an open, honest, and impartial discussion. Not only economists spoke. Lawyers, enterprise directors, and leaders of central and republic economic departments expressed their opinion. A distinguishing feature of probably all the speeches was awareness of responsibility for the fate of perestroyka and the search for a way out of the crisis situation.

A quite wide range of opinions was observed within the framework of that general search. Extremes even met: ranging from proposals to return (with the proviso that it be temporary) to the edict system to calls for an immediate switch to a qualitatively new model of management. The whole spectrum of public forces and movements characteristic of the present stage of perestroyka was reflected here. There were also sharp arguments over private ownership...

[Nikitin] What, incidentally, is your personal opinion of this question, which has become almost the epicenter of the debate being conducted in our society?

[Abalkin] I wish to emphasize once again that I am against lightweight judgments, word games, and the simplification of very complex problems. Today it is frequently possible to hear: "There is no need to fear private ownership! You must call everything by its proper name!" Here emotions clearly prevail over the cold voice of reason.

The problem of private ownership did not arise today. It has a big history and colossal literature, and outstanding minds have wrestled with it. Private ownership has been cursed and idolized. And we want to resolve this problem in a jiffy... The structure of ownership relations both here and throughout the world is so complex today that it does not fit within a simple correlation between state and private ownership. There are many modifications and transitional forms. And the whole complexity of modern relations cannot be described in 19th-century terms.

It is more correct, in my view, to speak of individual labor ownership, which also has many forms and modifications. Such ownership based on labor as the birth sign of socialism can become an inalienable element of the structure of socialist ownership.

[Nikitin] Does this mean there can be no question of wage labor?

[Abalkin] Wage labor is not an everyday term but a strictly scientific concept on a par with the concept of capital. Therefore I believe that wage labor and socialism are incompatible. We must not confuse the essential concept of wage labor and the juridical form of hire.

[Nikitin] How do you picture the further development of the economic reform?

[Abalkin] This question will be the object of broad and, I hope, constructive discussion at the upcoming conference. Material for this discussion was prepared by the organizing committee and published in advance in EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA. We have already had the first responses. There was a discussion at the Academy of the National Economy. So my assessments are of a preliminary nature. The conference will make it possible to amplify and correct a great deal and to find a more correct solution. Otherwise there is no point in holding it.

At the same time there are questions which are already quite clear today. Vigorous measures are needed (society is tired of expectations)—quite tough and at times unpopular measures. If we do not manage to achieve a breakthrough in the consumer market before the end of next year and balance the excessive growth of monetary income (more than 12 percent during the first 9 months of this year alone), the situation will get out of control.

The priority measures for this period, formulated by the government and approved by the Supreme Soviet, form the substance of the first stage of developing the reform. Just over 1 year is being allocated to it, but a very great deal has to be done. And the temptation to return to the "tested" methods of administrative pressure and officiousness is appearing. But this path cannot change the

state of affairs in the economy. This would not be a step along the path of reform but the start of its curtailment.

[Nikitin] You spoke of the first stage. Does this mean there are a second, third, and subsequent stages?

[Abalkin] Yes, our proposals provide for a number of successive stages in developing the reform. The start of the second stage has been defined quite precisely: 1991. By that time, it may confidently be stated, a package of new laws on ownership, on land and land use, on the socialist enterprise, on leasing, and on a unified tax system will have been adopted and come into force. It is then that all the union and autonomous republics and all the regions will go over to self-management and self-financing. Finally, a new 5-year plan will come into force—new not only in terms of its number (the 13th!) but also in terms of its nature, substance, and methodological approaches. It is still too early to speak of it more specifically. All the work lies ahead.

Of course, this does not mean that everything will now proceed easily and simply. In our assessment, it will take approximately 2 more years to fine-tune the new management conditions. Additional efforts will be required to reduce the state budget deficit and stabilize the consumer market. Antimonopoly measures and anti-inflation regulators have to be put into effect. Under conditions of developing the socialist market we have to implement a special program of measures for the social protection of low-paid sections of the population, large families, and people on a fixed income.

All this and much else forms the substance of the second stage of the reform. The successful completion of this stage will create preconditions for further deepening the reform and will make it possible to utilize its tremendous potential.

[Nikitin] People are awaiting an appreciable improvement in affairs in the consumer market at the beginning of the nineties, a rise in their living standards...

[Abalkin] They must not wait but create. Only those who have lost the ability to work and who need public care can expect. And many of them will feel an improvement in their situation even earlier. On the whole, however, a rise in living standards can only happen as economic efficiency grows. The possibilities of any redistribution have already been exhausted. It would be criminal to increase the budget deficit. It is inadmissible to reduce further—as has been done in the plan for next year—investments in expanding and modernizing production. Thus, there is just one way—to improve efficiency and work better.

I believe that in the new economic mechanism, including the new plan model, it is necessary to change the connection between social programs and efficiency. How has it been hitherto? Plans relating to efficiency were frustrated. On the other hand, social measures (in terms of expenditure of funds) were quite often overfulfilled. Hence the budget deficit and the growing discrepancy between demand and supply in the consumer market.

The scale and timeframes for realizing social programs must be made directly dependent on growth in efficiency. It is possible, for example, to lay down normatives stipulating that 80 percent of the increase in national income goes for consumption purposes. And how much this will be—R10, R15, or R20 billion—depends on the rate of increase in national income.

Much in the realization of social programs will now depend on republic and local organs. They have been given great rights and resources. They are also accountable. Who is to blame, in actual fact, for the fact that during the first 9 months of the year the annual program for housing construction was fulfilled by 41 percent in Moldavia, 42 percent in Georgia, and 43 percent in Estonia? Why during this same period was the annual target for commissioning hospitals fulfilled by just 25 percent in Azerbaijan, and that for boarding homes for the elderly and disabled by 22 percent in the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic and 18 percent in the Ukraine? What can one expect, given such an attitude to the matter? Local organs need not to write "petitions" to Moscow but to step up demands and demand the full and qualitative assimilation of resources.

[Nikitin] Numerous references to the uncontrolled growth in incomes and their unjust distribution have given rise to proposals to implement monetary reform. Is this exceptional measure provided for in the economic reform concept?

[Abalkin] No, this measure is not provided for. It is not just a matter of reluctance to implement such a reform. An analysis conducted by scientists and specialists has convincingly shown that it is impossible and inexpedient. The authors of the proposals to implement monetary reform display insufficient competence on this question and totally ignore its destructive economic and social consequences in the present situation.

As regards the distribution of monetary incomes and, above all, savings, here too, unfortunately, there are more myths than knowledge of the actual picture. Here are the exhaustive statistics of the USSR Savings Bank. According to these, at the beginning of this year there were 196 million deposits worth a total of R296.7 billion. It is not hard to calculate that the average size of a deposit was R1,514. More than one-third of the deposits were less than R300. More than half of all the savings (R157.6 billion) belonged to people whose total investment was between R1,000 and R5,000. Large deposits (over R25,000) accounted for just 0.6 percent of the sum total of the population's savings. Not a single deposit of more than R200,000 has been registered at the Savings Bank.

[Nikitin] But these data probably do not take account of the fact that one person may have several savings books?

[Abalkin] This does happen, it is true. Therefore a control analysis was conducted with the help of the very reliable and representative statistics of family budgets. This analysis showed that 87-88 percent of families of workers, employees, and kolkhoz members have savings. But the savings themselves take different forms. There are deposits in the Savings Bank, in insurance policies, and in mutual aid funds and savings in cash. The fluctuations are as follows: 61-63 percent of families with an average per capita income of up to R50 a month have savings, as against 95-97 percent of families with an income of more than R250.

In short, we must struggle not against high incomes but against unearned incomes obtained through speculation, bribery, deception, and theft. Wage an uncompromising struggle. But it is still more important to rule out the possibility of obtaining such incomes by creating an appropriate economic and legal mechanism.

[Nikitin] Your attitude toward monetary reform is categorical and unambiguous. Does it follow from this that you rule out alternative options and the possibility of comparing different approaches?

[Abalkin] If I am convinced that this measure is erroneous and leads to extremely negative consequences (and I am convinced of this), I must say so clearly and definitely. Ostentatious liberalism—"Let us think and discuss"—is out of place here. As for alternatives, the materials submitted for discussion at the conference set forth three possible options or scenarios for developing the reform. I believe that they will be the object of quite sharp polemics, which will make it possible to better assess the pros and cons of each of them. But discussion cannot go on ad infinitum. Sooner or later we will have to plump for one of the options. Choice is a function not of science but of politics. The timing of the choice is one of the most complex duties of the political leadership.

[Nikitin] In conclusion I would like to ask: How will the conference be organized, and who will participate in it?

[Abalkin] The conference will commence with a plenary session in the House of Unions. But there will be none of the customary long reports there. The materials submitted for discussion have been published in advance. This makes it possible to get down to business at once—to discussing the proposed alternatives and means of resolving particular problems.

It is also proposed to hold "roundtables" devoted to analysis of the connection between economics and politics and to foreign experience of economic management. A news conference for Soviet and foreign journalists is planned.

Scientists and economic planners, leaders of ministries and central economic departments, USSR people's deputies, party workers and trade union activists, and representatives of all the union republics have been invited to participate in the conference. People with differing experience and views and supporters of different scientific schools will address the conference.

Only in the course of open discussion can a statewide program for deepening the economic reform emerge. A program which will not be the fruit of armchair judgments but the result of collective interpretation of urgent socioeconomic transformations and a synthesis of science and practice. This is the intention of the conference organizers. This is the government's policy of elaborating the most important documents of statewide significance.

Slyunkov Closing Speech at Economic Conference

PM1611102789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Nov 89 First Edition p 2

["Abbreviated" version of closing speech delivered by N.N. Slyunkov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, at the 13-15 November All-Union Scientific and Practical Conference on Problems of Radical Economic Reform: "Strategy and Tactics of Economic Reform"]

[Text] The debate at the conference is of fundamental importance. The reports and speeches at the plenary sittings, along with the detailed and critical discussion of problems in sections, have enabled us to deepen our understanding of the tasks facing the country and see more clearly the means of resolving them.

Of course, all the vast material produced by the conference still has to be analyzed and generalized. Serious analysis and consideration of all the economic, political, and social aspects are necessary in order to adopt well-gauged decisions. From the diverse opinions and proposals it is necessary to single out and employ in practical work those which are aimed at improving matters in the economy and speeding up perestroyka.

The CPSU and the Soviet people have chosen the socialist path of development and will proceed along it on the basis of their own values, the main ones of which are public ownership, the power of the working people, and the party's leading role as the political vanguard.

In a report delivered at the 19th All-Union Party Conference M.S. Gorbachev singled out the main parameters for a qualitatively new state of society. This is socialism in the Leninist sense of the word, socialism with a democratic and human complexion. A society where people really are the purpose of social development.

The way toward such a society lies via the restructuring of the entire system of social relations and political and economic reform. We are all unanimous in realizing the need for profound changes. It is now extremely important to concentrate our efforts on the forms and methods of perestroyka and make use of our own and world experience in this.

If we resolve the complex tasks of democratizing society and creating an effective economic mechanism and

shape a new economic system that corresponds with the nature of scientific socialism, the success of perestroyka will be guaranteed.

Today we have made appreciable progress in our revolutionary renewal. The foundation of perestroyka—democratization, glasnost, and decentralization of management—has been laid. We have worked out where we are, at what level. In contact with reality, reform has revealed the problems and difficulties. We have seen our shortcomings and serious deficiencies. Debates, questioning, and clashes of viewpoints and opinions are under way, and acute situations are sometimes created. But by and large the people have accepted perestroyka and have vigorously set about putting it into effect.

I must be frank and say that Soviet people expected great things of reform. They judge economic development and its results by the state of the consumer market and the extent to which their requirements are satisfied. That is why the question raised by many speakers is natural: What is this—the result of economic reform or the consequence of its inconsistent, contradictory, and piecemeal implementation?

I believe that we can draw the following conclusion: The correct strategic course has been plotted. The right choice of economic approaches was made. Our economy will be unable to enter a qualitatively new state without the restructuring of ownership relations, the creation of a socialist market, the development of economic accountability [khozraschet], the transfer of enterprises, republics, and regions to the principle of self-management and self-financing, pricing reform, and the improvement of the credit, finance, and tax system.

I think that those comrades who believe that practical implementation of reform is the heart of the matter are correct. Indecision, indeterminateness, incompleteness, and even deviations were sometimes permitted here. Reform has been implemented piecemeal. Some steps were taken separately, without mutual coordination. Timeframes and phases were disrupted. Many correct theses were not backed up by effective logistical mechanisms.

Industrial associations, enterprises, collective farms [kolkhozes], and state farms [sovkhozes] have not hitherto really obtained the proclaimed independence and rights to self-management. The requisite conditions have not yet been created for their transfer to complete economic accountability. Nor was social consciousness ready for drastic changes in economic life.

Problems of production relations and ownership have been vigorously discussed at the conference. These represent a fundamental question determining the essence of the social system. That is why we have to treat the proposals voiced here attentively and with great responsibility.

What do we consider to be beyond revision? The socialist character of our production relations and our ownership, which do not permit the exploitation of man by man.

Our task is to reveal the total diversity of socialist ownership—state, cooperative, communal, individual—and enable people to display initiative and independence, escape from their alienation, and render the worker truly the master of the means of production. The development of diverse forms of socialist ownership must ensure increasingly full implementation of the main principle in our society "from each according to his ability, to each according to his work."

The deepening of reform is impossible without the creation of a socialist market. We must make use of every instrument that enables us to eliminate the deficit: state orders, prices which equalize supply and demand, antimonopoly legislation, and the reduction of accumulated commodity and material stocks, which have already topped R500 billion.

Greater autonomy in selling some of the industrial and technical output produced in excess of the state order may be the first step. The accelerated development of wholesale trade is an important factor in economic life.

Pricing reform has become extremely necessary. Many scientists and practical specialists spoke correctly about this. The question is how in fact to implement this reform. On the whole two viewpoints have been voiced.

First. We should first revise prices to bring them closer to socially necessary expenditure and to relative world price levels. Then actively crank up the mechanisms of market pricing.

The other viewpoint proceeds from the premise that we do not need a one-shot revision of prices. Ongoing price reform is proposed instead. This option was proposed in the report at the conference.

In my view, the first option is more preferable. It enables us to improve economic relations more rapidly, speed up the introduction of economic accountability at enterprises and in sectors and regions, and develop more vigorously mutually beneficial foreign economic ties. A firm foundation would emerge for a transition to prices that equalize supply and demand for goods. Conditions would be created for compiling the 13th 5-Year Plan at the new prices, rather than old, expenditure-driven prices.

Another task that is new to us—the creation of a market for financial resources—must be resolved in order to shape market relations. Its main purpose is to overcome the sluggishness of the distribution system for capital investments and rapidly transfer financial resources from enterprises and the population to spheres where they can be put to most effective use. In the strategic context the creation of such a market signifies the

replacement of bureaucratic distribution mechanisms with flexible methods of supply and demand.

These crucial aspects of the socialist market cannot develop automatically or on command. We must improve banking affairs, fundamentally restructure the tax system, and strengthen the ruble.

Above all we need to enhance the role of the USSR State Bank [Gosbank]. It must be an important organ of economic regulation and be maintained by a modern interest policy, a system of compulsory reserves, and civilized forms of organizing the state debt. Irrational use of credit resources must be stopped.

The stress is also changing in the organization of finance. Taxation policy is moving to center stage. Its purely fiscal elements are increasingly giving way to stimulation of structural changes in the economy and resource-saving. A tax law will have to be elaborated to defend the interests of both society and every enterprise and individual worker. There is an urgent need for a tax service to be organized.

The effectiveness of our economy is in many respects determined by the extent to which reform affects the acceleration of scientific and technical progress. I believe that great attention was devoted to this problem at the conference. The results of the phase of economic reform which we have already experienced show that it has not proved possible to eliminate the negative trends in the sphere of scientific and technical progress. The economy persists in being unreceptive to innovation. Fixed production capital continues to age. The metals- and energy-intensiveness of national income are falling slowly.

It is clear that we need a new scientific and technical policy and new approaches to the management of scientific and technical development. It must be part of an integrated mechanism for the management of socialist social production. But the entire economic mechanism and all its components must be oriented to speeding up the scientific and technical revolution.

It is important to work out a system of preferential taxation and credit provision, to create the conditions for accelerating the amortization of fixed capital, and to link the prices and wages mechanism of all participants in the investment cycle with end results. Along with the strengthening of the resource base of science, we must change many of the forms and methods of work used by research collectives and management organs.

Clearly the creative collective, contracted to work on a specific problem, should be made the main component. This will make it possible to channel funds not into the upkeep of institutes but into the resolution of scientific and technical tasks.

We must be more flexible in our use of the methods of state influence over scientific and technical development through the implementation of a single scientific, technical, investment, and structural policy. In this connection particular attention should be given to elaborating a system of scientific, technical, and socioeconomic forecasting and to setting priorities. It is even possible to partially reduce the number of priority programs and ensure that their plans and the people who carry them out are selected on competitive principles.

Now to turn to the restructuring of the organizational structure of economic management. Here it has been noted that we have no comprehensive, integrated plan for the general layout of management. Yes, we need such a plan. Without one there will not be the proper clarity in the roles and functions of ministries and the USSR Council of Ministers Bureau for National Economic Complexes. The relationship between production structures and the USSR State Planning Committee [Gosplan], the USSR State Committee for Material and Technical Supply, and other departments has still not been defined. It will be hard to run the national economy without this.

A qualitatively new stage in the transformations that are being implemented and in the economic and political reform is linked with the transition of republics and regions to the principles of self-management and self-financing. This presupposes above all the creation of economic and legal conditions for the effective economic management of enterprises and regions. The independent earning of funds and their optimum distribution and utilization will make it possible to set up the material base for complete authority on the part of the soviets from top to bottom. Preparations are under way to test-run and fine-tune the new territorial economic management mechanism in a number of the country's republics and regions as of 1 January 1990.

We are taking a step which will incorporate regional factors of economic and social progress more fully. But if this is carried out in an ill-conceived manner it could lead to major difficulties in developing an integrated national economic complex and to the exacerbation of relations between republics. That is why the forms and methods of regional economic accountability should be comprehensively grounded in science and tested in practice.

The optimum correlation between rights and obligations should be ensured for union, republic, and local organs with regard to the use of natural resources, land, and property. We must guarantee full independence for enterprises and make them subordinate solely to USSR law. A full-fledged all-union market—rather than isolated regional markets—can be developed on this basis. Each enterprise should cooperate directly with local, republic, and union budgets through the tax system. We must maintain the unity of the country's credit and monetary system. Banks should serve the needs of republics and regions as components of an integrated system run by the central bank.

We should enter the 13th 5-Year Plan with a new territorial management mechanism under which each republic and region would have an interest in making full use of all the reserves for improving end results as the basis of their own prosperity and the USSR's power and in enjoying budgetary independence.

The restructuring of foreign economic ties is part and parcel of the reform. Despite a certain galvanization in enterprises' import-export activities, positive results have not been achieved on the whole. The irrational utilization of foreign currency and foreign credit continues. The balance of payments has deteriorated. The foreign debt has reached dangerous levels. For the first time we are running debts with the European socialist countries. The foreign-currency financial regulation of imports and exports continues to be implemented through the state budget. The system of foreign-currency levies is unsophisticated too.

Vigorous measures are needed to switch this entire sphere to economic methods of management, to elaborate a system of taxes, customs duties, and tariffs, and to introduce effective credit arrangements.

Viewing the long-term issues of the development of reform today, we cannot avoid urgent problems. In order to improve the economy in reality rather than in theory we must eliminate the state budget deficit, resolutely break the inflationary tendencies, put a stop to the unjustified printing of money, and strengthen the ruble.

The main cause of the unjustified increase in monetary income lies in the piecemeal introduction of the new economic mechanism and the defectiveness of highly important elements which determine it (the tax system, pricing, and financial and credit levers). The shaping of wages funds is tied firmly to gross output. This has created unjustifiable growth in the profits and incomes of enterprises and cooperatives.

It is not easy to balance the money supply and production. It will require tough measures of state regulation, and these may not be to many people's liking. These measures may be criticized, but we cannot buck the objective laws of economics.

A no less important aspect is to satisfy the market for consumer goods. As of next year we must also think about introducing a system of additional measures and privileges to encourage production of these goods. At the same time, it is important to ease the pressure exerted on the consumer market by the funds accumulated by the population. The conference participants' speeches have contained many specific proposals on these matters. They should all be examined and decisions made on each of them.

The substantial untapped potential in capital construction for improving the economy should be utilized. The prevailing situation in the investment sphere has become a constraint on the country's development. The main cause of these negative processes was the introduction of an expenditure-driven economic mechanism in 1986. It was geared to interim, gross indicators and did not stimulate the growth of finished construction output—the commissioning of projects and the assimilation of design capacities. Over the past 3 years more than R20 billion in fixed capital has not been commissioned. The backlog of unfinished construction work has increased by R38 billion, which has weighed heavy on the economy, swallowing up enormous financial and material resources without producing any return. There are many other "bottlenecks" in construction.

The USSR Council of Ministers resolution "On Certain Measures To Improve the State of Affairs in Capital Construction" was recently adopted, but the search for more efficient forms of economic management in capital construction must go on.

The agroindustrial complex is faced with great tasks. In the next few years it is very important to move away from imports and switch to making the country self-sufficient in basic foodstuffs.

The CPSU Central Committee March (1989) Plenum defined the strategic avenues for resolving the complex problems of the agroindustrial complex. It will be necessary to substantially strengthen the material and technical base of all its components and carry out social restructuring of the countryside.

The fundamental restructuring of the system of agrarian relations is taking place in key directions: the creation of equal economic conditions for different types of farm, the development of market relations, and the assimilation of economic methods for regulating food production and controlling its quality.

The success of the economic reform will largely depend on the economic training of cadres. The situation in this area is alarming. According to the results of sociological research almost half of all leaders and specialists do not have a clear grasp of the essence of the new economic management methods. One in every two engineering and technical workers lacks the necessary range of economic knowledge. A fundamental renewal of the content of the training given to specialists at higher and secondary specialized educational establishments is needed, as is extensive retraining and improvements in the qualifications of engineering and technical workers and enterprise and association leaders.

The conference expressed many important ideas and specific constructive proposals on measures to improve the economy and fundamental approaches toward the elaboration of the 13th 5-Year Plan. I think that, in accordance with our exchange of opinions, it would be correct to instruct the USSR Council of Ministers State Commission for Economic Reform along with the Gosplan, the State Committee for Science and Technology, the Ministry of Finance, the State Committee for Construction, the USSR Academy of Sciences, and other scientific and economic institutions to generalize all

these proposals and clarify the most important ways and means of deepening and accelerating economic reform.

Above all, we need to take specific measures to strengthen the ruble, balance the population's monetary income and spending, stabilize the consumer market, work out the positions and determine the timetable for carrying out pricing reform, restructure the credit and monetary system, shape a financial market, and provide economic incentives for the introduction of scientific and technical progress.

A sitting of the CPSU Central Committee Commission for Questions of Socioeconomic Policy will examine the progress of economic reform. In view of the importance and urgency of all this work it should be completed this November.

In conclusion, permit me to express the confidence that, taking a responsible approach to the resolution of the difficult problems of economic development and uniting all our intellectual and creative forces to that end, we will be able to ensure the success of perestroyka.

Abalkin Comments on Results

LD1511205889 Moscow TASS in English 2044 GMT 15 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 15 TASS—A three day all-union scientific-practical conference on problems of the radical reform of the Soviet economy, which ended here today, was attended by over 1,400 economists, economic managers and representatives of public organisations.

A broad range of opinions on the course and prospects of the current Soviet economic reform were expressed by over 250 speakers, Soviet and foreign journalists have been told at a news conference by Leonid Abalkin, deputy Soviet prime minister and chairman of the Council of Ministers' State Commission for Economic Reform.

He described the discussion as a major element in the Soviet Government's activities. The newly formed government has been functioning for about four months, enough to specify the positions, intentions, immediate and long-range plans.

The plan and the budget for 1990 have been drafted and endorsed at the supreme legislative body of the USSR. These documents, which are of a complex, to a major extent emergency character, set immediate intentions.

A number of steps have been taken to put things in order in the financial sphere, in the consumer market, to regulate money incomes. It is now essential to prepare not only immediate conditions, but for forming new conditions of the country's economic and social development, radical changes in the system of methods of management of the economy. That question was put on the agenda of the second Congress of Soviet People's Deputies beginning on December 12.

The Soviet people are waiting for serious measures and decisions, Abalkin said. The Soviet Government should submit to the congress a serious programme of cardinal changes and prospects of the country's socio-economic development for the 13th five-year period.

Summing up the results of the forum, Abalkin said that a wealth of material obtained should be comprehended in a brief period of time and reflected in the documents and decisions being drafted.

Interview With Conference Delegate

LD1511211289 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 15 Nov 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] An all-union practical conference on problems of radical economic reform ended its work in Moscow today.

[Correspondent A. Fedorovich] And so, after 3 days of discussions, it may be said that there is a light at the end of the tunnel. A scenario of the development of economic reform, which is being created by the joint efforts of scientists, specialists, economic planners, and party workers is becoming clearer.

Comrade Slyunkov, who summed up the results of the conference, spoke at a plenary session today. The conference discussed a broad range of issues, from an analysis of critical situations in the country's national economy—the work of each and everyone is vital—to the work of economic mechanisms, a market and not a bazaar, the tax system, the structure of ownership, and the restructuring of production relations.

At the conference various opinions could be heard which did not get in the way of a collective search for an answer to what is arguably the main question: What should the new economy of our country be like?

[Begin recording] [video shows Fedorovich interviewing USSR People's Deputy Bunich in hall] [Fedorovich] Tell me, do you believe that the Soviet economy can achieve a social turn-around toward the individual?

[Bunich] Well, I believe that it can, and there is no doubt that there is a general concept for this. And this general concept is ours, on the one hand, and that which we can see belonging to the whole of mankind. And our crisis is not the first crisis in the world: All countries have been through crises and they come out of them, and ours, incidentally, is not the worst of crisis. But we are just not used to them, having declared perestroyka and having declared acceleration, and then we find ourself in the opposite situation—about 5-10 percent behind.

[Fedorovich] But this crisis is not yet a catastrophe?

[Bunich] No, generally speaking, a way out of a crisis has always been found, and I think that we shall find a way out of this one. In other words, in my opinion, there is no doubt there is a potential for a way out of this crisis. We

have a genral concept. Right now it is a matter more or less of specific measures. It is now a question of struggle, a struggle for this concept.

[Fedorovich] The role of economic science is very great here, isn't it?

[Bunich] You know, economic science does not run the country. It is just that there are some representatives of economic science who, in certain numbers, participate in the Supreme Soviet. There are also some representatives of science who participate directly in the bodies of executive power. This is, of course, a new situation because it did not happen before. But at the same time, I would not say that economic science is everything. It is a thousand times greater than what was before, but I still think that is a thousand times less than it should be.

[Fedorovich] But are its capabilities now being surveyed?

[Bunich] It, too, is being reviewed. You can imagine the long period of that science which came under no less a baptism of fire than a marshal of the Soviet Union. Nevertheless, something sprouted and something existed—perhaps one can name a number of splendid names. Now one can say that there is a rebirth, but one could hardly imagine the huge detachment of young people who are pouring in. Revolutions have always rapidly developed people—new people come along. But let us have a little time for this. This is a period of incubation—a child also needs a little time to find itself. But let us cut down this period of incubation, but not so that a deformed person is born. That is what I believe. [end recording]

Supreme Soviet Session

Gorbachev 13 Nov Supreme Soviet Speech

LD1511173789 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1600 GMT 13 Nov 89

[Speech by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, at the USSR Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin, Moscow on 13 November—from the recorded relay]

[Text] I think that within the framework of the political process and the political reform that is underway on the basis of the decisions made by the 19th party conference and on the basis of the relevant decisions made by the Congress of People's Deputies, many things that pertain to the functioning of our political system are being made more precise. Above all, it pertains to the fact that a line, a political line of the party is being implemented. It has been given expression and has been supported by the people and it is on the basis of this line that the political reform has gotten off the ground. To be precise, the division of funtions is what is meant here. We did embark on this path and —as it turns out—it is not a straightforward or easy path. It is even a painful path. But we are moving along it, we are moving along it. The enhanced role of the Congress of People's Deputies which has shown its strength and of the current Supreme Soviet is, above all else, evidence of this.

The executive power, in the shape of our government, is also currently defining and taking its place more precisely. A process of an in-depth perestroyka of the activities of the party itself, a process of renewal, which is not without problems of its own either, has begun. Renewal processes are essential to the party, above all from the viewpoint of the party ridding itself of functions that are not a part of its make-up and that it has been carrying out—the party should genuinely become proficient in the functions that stem from its position as the political vanguard in society.

Has this process been completed or not? I think it is only just beginning to get underway. I think we needed both the congress and the discussion that preceded it in order for this process to become more dynamic, in order for this process to come to its completion through the consolidation of this line aimed at understanding and discovering the essence of the party's new role in our society that is renewing itself, its new role at the stage of perestroyka.

All of this has been decided by the Central Committee plenum: both to hold the congress and to hold the party discussion, during which program questions will be discussed and during which the new rules should also be discussed and adopted. The rules and all these documents will define this new role. The congress, we hope, will be a turning point in the party's destiny. I think one should approach this with enormous responsibility

We regard all of these processes as normal and essential. They correspond precisely to the tasks and goals of perestroyka. However, does it therefore appear essential that we should be getting down to a discussion with the overtones—Comrade Andreyeva mentioned this and I agree—with speculative overtones? This, I think, should be rejected by us. Since the party has begun to tackle it, let the process continue. This is the first part.

Here is the second part and the second thesis from which my subsequent proposals will stem. In principle, can we or can we not discuss this question altogether? But it is being discussed! The only thing I would disagree with as regards the first and the last speakers is when they mention the phrase "a significant part."

Well, let me tell you that a significant part of society and of the working class in particular, is very alarmed by the attempts to play down the party and to deal it a blow. This exists too, you know. So, you know, we have no need of people pretending that they possess the truth and the latest information. No, I think it is necessary to speak of a process. It is fundamentally a healthy process. It blends itself and is in tune with the context of the discussion of the question of coming to understand the essence of the party's new role.

The only thing is, in my view, that if someone wishes in this discussion to weaken the party I do not think, comrades, that this is in our common interest. This would not be in keeping now with the tasks of perestroyka and with all the complicated tasks we are tackling at this stage.

After all, generally speaking, turbulent processes of handing power downwards are taking place in all directions, affecting the soviets and economic management, and they are taking place within the framework of decentralization, democratization, and glasnost. That is to say, powerful centrifugal forces are at work.

Any organism can always live and function correctly if there exist mechanisms that act as a counterweight, mechanisms that make for a balance, so that a certain equilibrium is maintained. In this sense, the integration and consolidation of forces, the unification of forces around the goals of perestroyka, around the implementation of the progressive policy of perestroyka—I think I do not, as yet, see in our country another force capable of replacing the CPSU.

That is why the party, while renewing itself, should tackle this task. And that is why it is necessary to reject the proposals which are particularly odious, those that under the cover of democratization and under the cover of criticism—a just criticism of the party's errors in the past—wish to put the party's role in doubt. Comrades, I think that this would be a great error. It would be a gift to someone—but not to ourselves.

So, people are worried that this is the way in which this process is unfolding. So, this question, along with any other, can be discussed. Just look how many questions which, one way or another, deal with the Constitution and had to be dealt with at this sitting alone. Well, the federation—we will also speak of that, and so on and so forth.

I think that if we now forced this issue through, if we were to put emphasis on it, if we regarded this problem as being of an extraordinary nature, it would cause unnecessary concern and alarm in our society. At the same time the Constitutional Commission—and I mention the Constitutional commission because there was a question about whether its report should be made at the congress but I will not now deal with this—the Constitutional Commission, during the course of preparing its own proposals and while elaborating them, can examine and deal with these considerations and it can put forward these proposals as normal for consideration.

That is why this is what I would say: It seems to me that positive conclusions should be drawn from the fact that people are discussing these issues. People wish to see the party as a renewed and effective force behind perestroyka, one that is close to the people and that fulfills new functions. That is why the only thing that must be prevented from happening is that speculative subjects should not be put our way under the guise of this healthy process.

Well, those are the considerations I wanted to tell you about. And, that is why...[Gorbachev changes thought] I think, well, were you to say: will this Article remain as it is? I think that, along with many Articles, it will be necessary to bring it into line—already in the current context—with the new situation. But I am in favor of this taking place through normal channels and within the framework of a normal process.

Moscow TV Airs 15 Nov Supreme Soviet Proceedings

1615 GMT

LD1511175689

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1615 GMT on 15 November begins carrying a recorded relay of the 15 November Supreme Soviet proceedings in the Kremlin.

The program is introduced by an announcer who sums up the proceedings of the separate sessions of the two chambers of the Supreme Soviet and then introduces the joint evening session which is chaired by Lukyanov.

Lukyanov calls on deputies to register their presence; there is a quorum. He then recaps today's separate sessions: the Soviet of Nationalities discussed the law on languages; the Soviet of the Union discussed the law on citizenship. Lukyanov suggests that the session hears representatives of the commissions dealing with those bills. There are no objections so the floor is offered to Chingiz Aytmatov, chairman of the Kirghiz Union of Writers.

At 1619 GMT Aytmatov beings talking about the bill discussed in the Soviet of Nationalities briefly summarizing the bill's contents. He says that he anticipates great international interest in the Soviet language law. It is a far-reaching basis of a law-governed state, Aytmatov notes. The past command and administrative system swept many conflicts under the carpet and the issue has been ducked for too long, but perestroyka has put an end to all that, he believes. Languages must exist side by side without domination. Aytmatov praises the development of the languages of the country under Soviet rule although he admits that there are some problems. He refers very generally to interethnic strife and expresses generalized criticism and extremism and artificial attempts to merge people into one category. However, a unified democratic state is essential and equality is a good thing, he says. He then enumerates the principles involved in the bill. Policy must favor the culture of all our peoples, he says. The Russian language in the USSR is like the dome on top of a cathedral.

At 1638 GMT Aytmatov's remarks become unmonitorable for 1 minute.

At 1639 GMT he is heard summing up his speech and concluding that this law is a long-term issue.

1641 GMT

LD1511184189

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1641 GMT on 15 November continues its recorded relay of the 15 November Supreme Soviet proceedings in the Kremlin.

Lukyanov invites comments from the floor and several deputies put questions to Aytmatov on various aspects of the bill.

At 1643 GMT Lukyanov goes on to the law on citizenship offering the floor to deputy Lubenchenko from the Soviet of the Union Commission dealing with that bill. Lubenchenko outlines provisions contained in the bill. He denies the existence of absolute sovereignty; bodies such as the united nations show that no country has it. He refers to the importance of observing international law and agreements and to the moral aspect. He sees this bill as closely linked in spirit to the language law and others. The bill is a major step forward, he believes. He proposes that it be published for nationwide discussion before the second reading. At 1651 GMT he stops speaking. The transmission is interrupted for 16 minutes while a children's program is carried.

At 1707 GMT the session coverage resumes. Lukyanov hands over to Deputy Tarazevich, chairman of Soviet of Nationalities Commission for Nationalities Policy and Relations between Nationalities, who speaks about the third bill examined—the one dealing with the rights of citizens who are living outside their national area. The bill was put together by the members of a number of different committees and commissions of the Supreme Soviet, as well as various outside bodies, he explains. The rights of such a citizen are guaranteed, the preamble declares. Tarazevich runs through the preamble. The formation of some "national rayons" is under consideration, and even of "national settlements" and "national rural soviets" for areas where the population is ethnically mixed, and one national group predominates, he says. The national groups are to be given representation within the local authorities and provision will also be made for the creation of national linguistic, cultural and social clubs and societies, he concludes.

At 1719 GMT Deputy Minnulin asks a question about the nature of the ties that national groups will be allowed to establish. Another unidentified deputy asks about the exact nature of a se[illegible]ment in which there are 51 percent Russians and 49 percent Ukrainians; the settlement is in the Ukraine, he explains. The speaker points to the bureaucratic difficulties here, and goes on to say that, in general, there are no interethnic problems so why create them by means of bureaucratic intricacies?

Several deputies ask short questions on the bill.

At 1730 GMT Deputy Plotnieks asks about the formation of national areas in republics where the indigenous people are in the minority. Lukyanov interrupts to say that new proposals are out of order. Deputy Balayan asks about the Kurds. Tarazevich says that the question deserves further study. A deputy asks about educational provision for ethnic groups living outside their own area.

At 1737 GMT an unidentified deputy asks about the Jews in the USSR. Until recently, they were not even allowed to study Yiddish. Can they now establish ties with Jewish bodies abroad? Tarazevich says that such ties are possible.

At 1739 GMT Lukyanov says that 41 people wish to speak so there is a time problem. He also reads out a procedural complaint from 44 deputies. Some deputies, it is said, monopolize the time and prevent effective discussion.

An unidentified speaker asks: If Russian is the official language, what for example, does that formulation mean in Lithuania? Lukyanov clarifies: Russian is the language of interethnic communication; Lithuanian would be the "state language." Lukyanov suggests that the various amendments could be handed to the relevant commissions for discussion.

At 1745 GMT Lukyanov says that they will now take a vote on the various bills, accepting or rejecting them as a conceptual basis for further work.

1746 GMT

LD1511192989

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1746 GMT on 15 November continues its recorded relay of the 15 November Supreme Soviet proceedings in the Kremlin.

An unidentified deputy speaks about the possible infringement of minority rights because a child from an ethnic minority goes to school in a different area and has to use Russian or some other language.

Deputy Semenov says he disagrees with the previous speaker.

At 1754 GMT Deputy Landsbergis from Lithuania says that some languages are regarded as being "great," others are seen as "small." Lithuanians are often urged to use Russian when speaking to Poles, for example. This sort of thing must be resisted, he believes. He urges deputies to vote in favor of the law on language.

Lukyanov asks deputies to speak for no longer than 3 minutes.

An unidentified deputy says that it is necessary to know the language of the people among whom you are living.

At 1804 GMT Sakharov speaks about differentiating the language of interethnic communication and local languages.

Several unidentified deputies speak: the first says that Russian must remain the language of interethnic communication, although each language should retain its

individual worth; another says that, in principle, the law is unnecessary because all that is needed is a statement from the Supreme Soviet about the primacy of Russian as the language of interrepublican communication; another stresses the importance of the law on language because in the world at large, the forces of greater integration are at work, so the USSR must not be reduced to interethnic bickering.

At 1814 GMT Deputy Peters points to the anomaly that all Soviet languages are said to be "national" except Russian, which is absurd. Russian must remain the language of interethnic communication despite the "great power" implication of this state of affairs.

1818 GMT

LD1511202189

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1818 GMT on 15 November continues its recorded relay of the 15 November Supreme Soviet proceedings in the Kremlin.

An unidentified male deputy says that all republics should be given the right to make their own language the state language. Lukyanov says this is not very relevant; he underlines the value of Russian as an international language.

At 1822 GMT Lukyanov asks for a vote. The first vote to be taken is that on the law on language. Is the first reading approved? Should it be referred back to the commissions for further work? It is established that 391 deputies are present. There is a vote on whether the first reading is approved? Results: 325 for; 27 against; 13 abstained. The first reading is approved, and the bill will proceed for further work, Lukyanov says.

At 1827 GMT Lukyanov puts the next bill to the vote—on the rights of people living outside their national area. He has to repeat that they are voting on the concept, not on editorial details, which can be referred to a commission. The vote is taken. Results: 296 for; 40 against; 21 abstained. The bill is carried and will proceed further. He then invites speakers on the law on citizenship.

Two unidentified deputies speak. The first says that the notion of citizenship must be more closely linked to the republic in which a person lives; the second says he is surprised that there are no variants of different paragraphs of the three laws under discussion.

At 1836 GMT Deputy Boyars says that the laws makes no attempt to deal with dual nationality within the USSR. A Supreme Court collegium should be set up to look into the citizenship issue, he suggests. There must also be provision for restoring citizenship to a child who was deprived of it by the action of his parents and the same should apply to a women who married a foreigner, where the marriage has broken down.

At 1843 GMT Lukyanov puts the bill to the vote. Results: 323 for; 19 against; 11 abstained. The bill is passed.

An unidentified female deputy speaks about the small peoples that have no state-administrative formation of their own. Their interests must be safeguarded, she says, but by whom? There are international commitments to this effect. She calls for serious action to be taken to protect the small people of the North.

Lukyanov says that the question deserves further study. He then recaps on the voting figures for the evening session. Finally, he announces: "We will continue our work at a joint sitting of the chambers, which will open on Monday 20 November at 1000 in the morning in this hall."

The recorded relay then ends.

Supreme Soviet Discusses Nationalities Issues

LD1511200189 Moscow TASS in English 1931 GMT 15 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 15 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

The Soviet Parliament today approved a first reading of a package of bills aimed at the legal regulation of the new Soviet nationalities policy. The need for such a policy was noted at the September plenum of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee.

Presenting the bill on the languages of Soviet peoples, writer Chingiz Aytmatov, chairman of the Council of Nationalities Commission on the Development of Culture and Language, emphasised that the existence of the federal state requires that Russian be used as the Soviet Union's official language.

The overwhelming majority of the population knows Russian for historic reasons and by tradition. Union and autonomous republics have the right to establish the legal status of national languages as official languages on their territories.

Dwelling on inter-ethnic conflicts in many regions, Aytmatov warned against attempts to turn the language "from an instrument into a principle, from a means of communication into a tool of politics."

Various opinions were expressed during the debate. It was even declared that there was no need for such a law.

It was, specifically, proposed to adopt a declaration about the use of the Russian language as a means of inter-republican communication, while laws on languages should be adopted by republics. All the proposals will be discussed in detail when the bill is analysed by permanent parliamentary bodies.

The Supreme Soviet approved a first reading of the bill on the free national development of Soviet citizens,

residing outside their national-state formations or having no such formations on Soviet territory.

Georgiy Tarazevich, chairman of the Council of Nationalities Commission on Nationalities Policy, said that there are some 60 million such citizens in the Soviet Union.

Quite often their rights and liberties are restricted directly or indirectly, and their national requirements are overlooked.

National regions and settlements that existed in the Soviet Union in the twenties and were later eliminated should be restored. This will be one of the guarantees under the bill for free national and cultural development of Soviet peoples that do not have autonomy.

The bill on Soviet citizenship, that was also discussed by Parliament, emphasises the unity and equality of citizens of all republics, which corresponds to the Soviet Union's federal structure.

At the same time, the document confirms the right of republics to resolve all questions connected with their citizenship.

During the debate many deputies favoured approving a first reading of the bill. But other opinions were also expressed. Deputy Kazimira Prunskene of Lithuania said that the law on citizenship cannot be adopted before the new status of the USSR, and all the national-state formations it includes, is determined.

This stand was not supported by parliamentarians. By a majority vote the USSR Supreme Soviet approved a first reading of the fundamental provisions of the bill on Soviet citizenship. The bill will now go through its parliamentary committee stage.

The Soviet Parliament will reassemble for a bicameral meeting on Monday, November 20.

Abalkin Calls for State Control of Prices, Goods

LD1611112589 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1000 GMT 16 Nov 89

[Text] At the USSR Supreme Soviet session: Over to the correspondent's center in the Kremlin where Aleksandr Ruvinskiy is at the microphone.

[Ruvinskiy] Next week the Supreme Soviet is due to examine questions which are important for the country's economy and for each inhabitant. I am talking about additional measures to stablize the consumer market and to increase state control over prices. In connection with this, measures are being examined today at a joint session of the commission for issues of labor, prices, and social policy, the planning and budget-finance commission, and the commissions for consumer goods, trade, municipal, everyday services, and other services to the population. Specialists from many of our country's central departments have also been drawn in to the work of these commissions.

What measures are we talking about, first and foremost? First, it is proposed to expand the sphere of activity of state order for consumer goods, in particular those goods which are being sold at socially low prices, and to protect the domestic market from unjust exports.

Leonid Ivanovich Abalkin, speaking at today's session, quoted these examples: In 9 months of this year, 3,000 television sets were not supplied to the trade, and at the same time the plan for their exports was considerably overfulfilled. The same story applies to vacuum cleaners, other domestic wares, and various kinds of fish produce. But all this is happening without any infringement of existing laws. The government is proposing, for the 4th quarter of this year and for 1990, to suspend the operation of the corresponding clauses of the law on the enterprise.

This naturally requires a decision by the Supreme Soviet.

It is also envisaged to establish price-limits and fixed prices on basic foodstuffs, which obviously requires subsidies to those enterprises who produce these goods, first and foremost fruit and vegetable produce. But funds are needed for this. It is also proposed to set up a system of control over prices, both state and public, and to pool their efforts.

Immediately after Leonid Ivanovich Abalkin's report, he was literally bombarded with questions from the deputies. Well, we shall naturally be telling our listeners about how this debate goes and how it ends.

Legislation on Local Soviets Viewed

PM1611104589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Nov 89 Second Edition p 2

[Interview with N. Pivovarov, chairman of the Soviet of People's Deputies and Management and Self-Management Development Committee, by PRAVDA Parliamentary Observer M. Buzhkevich: "The Form Authority Should Take at Local Levels"; date and place unspecified; first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] USSR people's deputies and members of the USSR Supreme Soviet divide their time between plenary sessions and work in the USSR Supreme Soviet committees or commissions. Here, bills submitted by the government or other organs are discussed scrupulously, in detail, and from various points of view. Without this scrupulous discussion, based on knowledge of life and taking account of scientific recommendations and public opinion, there would be nothing to debate at the plenary sessions. A conversation between N. Pivovarov, chairman of the Soviet of People's Deputies and Management and Self-Management Development Committee, and our own parliamentary observer, M.

Buzhkevich, dealt with how this preparatory work is going and what results it has produced.

[Buzhkevich] Nikolay Dmitriyevich, was there a committee like yours in the old Supreme Soviet?

[Pivovarov] Strange though it may seem, no. This is just further evidence that local soviets were clearly underestimated until quite recently. The creation of our committee is a sign of the times, of restructuring. There used to be a lot of talk about enhancing the role of village, settlement, rayon, and city soviets of people's deputies. Various resolutions were adopted. But all this was nothing more than empty exhortations. Today the lack of rights of local organs of power, particularly at the lower levels, is an obvious fact. The principle of democratic centralism has long developed into total centralism and diktat by the higher-ranking soviets, ministries, and departments, and, in a number of cases, is even enshrined in law. The lower levels of authority have become totally dependent on enterprises and organizations in their territory that are themselves subordinate to union and republic ministries. I am referring to financial and material dependence. After all, it is a well known fact that whoever pays the piper calls the tune. In our case, they will decide how a particular territory is to be developed: in the interests of its inhabitants or a wealthy department.

[Buzhkevich] It is certainly true that we encounter the depressing poverty of local soviets every day: They lack the necessary resources for even the minimum maintenance of villages and cities. What is the reason for this?

[Pivovarov] What is there to be surprised about, when the very principle of forming local budgets has been turned on its head? Taxes levied in the territory of any soviet and also other payments go to line the pockets of higher organs. Local budgets now account for no more than 15 percent of the state budget. And the budgets of village soviets account for a mere 0.8 percent. But there are about 44,000 of these soviets and they are responsible for one-third of the population.

When our committee embarked on studying the problems of soviet activity and the development of local self-management, we decided to familiarize ourselves with foreign experience.

[Buzhkevich] Is that experience relevant to our sociopolitical conditions?

[Pivovarov] No one has any intention of mechanically adopting this experience and copying it without thinking. But it is important to reveal the trends. Those trends are as follows: the decentralization of power and the strengthening of local bodies is typical of the majority of developed countries. Britain, France, Italy, Switzerland, and many other states are broadening the powers of communes, districts, regions, cantons, and provinces.

Or take the municipal budget of local self-management. In the FRG it amounts to approximately half the federal budget. Every year the municipality of New York receives approximately $180 million from parking and traffic fines.

But let us go back to our domestic problems. The first stage in the reform of the country's political system is already complete: USSR people's deputies have been elected, they will soon be holding their second congress, and the USSR Supreme Soviet is at work. The next thing is the second stage: elections to republic and local soviets. They will be made up of some 2 million people's deputies. What kind of rights will they have, what will their powers be? This must be decided now, without delay. And it is perfectly logical that the USSR Council of Ministers has submitted for discussion by the USSR Supreme Soviet the bill "On the General Principles of Local Self-Management and the Local Economy in the USSR." Deputies were given the text of this draft law before the start of the USSR Supreme Soviet's fall session. Our committee was designated the leading committee in the drafting of this new law. So we have had a special responsibility.

[Buzhkevich] Were members of the committee satisfied with the draft law prepared by the Council of Ministers? Did you have to "rehash" it?

[Pivovarov] As a whole it is an appreciable step forward in the direction of reinterpreting the role played by local soviets. However, we focused our attention on the draft's shortcomings rather than its merits.

Everyone is now agreed that new life needs to be breathed into the soviets and fresh forces injected into them. This will primarily entail forming a system of self-management, creating an economic base, and broadening the rights of local organs of power so that they can really take charge of their territory. In this sense, far from everything is stipulated and provided for in the draft.

You ask whether our committee has the necessary knowledge to get to grips with this document? In other words, whether we are ready to play a part in the legislative process? Judge for yourself. Our committee is made up of 44 USSR people's deputies, half of whom are members of the Supreme Soviet. Among us are people with solid experience of work in soviet organs. The committee's deputy chairman, Nikolay Nikolayevich Danilyuk, who is head of the subcommittee on questions of the soviets' work, is also chairman of Khabarovsk Oblast Soviet Executive Committee. The leader of the subcommittee on questions of management and ensuring economic activity, Albert Petrovich Rubiks, is mayor of Riga. The self-management subcommittee is led by a strong advocate of self-management, the well-known builder Nikolay Ilich Travkin. And the ordinary committee members include many enterprising people with the ability to think on a large scale.

It goes without saying that it would be extremely difficult for us to cope on our own with assessing and revising the

bill submitted by the government within the short space of time stipulated by the session program. We have held a number of meetings with members of local soviet organs, appealed to all USSR people's deputies, and received hundreds of proposals from them. All the Supreme Soviet committees and commissions have been involved in analyzing the bill.

We have also enlisted in this work a number of scientists who are familiar with the legal and economic problems of developing local self-management and the work of the soviets. We have been given a great deal of assistance by the members of a number of departments of the USSR Supreme Soviet Secretariat. Studying the experience of the local self-management committtees already established has undoubtedly been of benefit. We are particularly interested in the organization of self-management in the capital's Baumanskiy Rayon, whose representatives we heard at one of the committee's sittings.

[Buzhkevich] What has been the upshot of all this "analyzing," and what has the collective research brought to light?

[Pivovarov] Originally, we had no thought of "rehashing" the government bill. Things turned out differently, however. New ideas arose and a different concept of this document took shape as a result of its study in depth and following an intensive exchange of opinions with officials of soviet organs and with people's deputies. Essentially, we have created a new edition of the draft, although in a certain respect it can be seen as the successor of the original document.

[Buzhkevich] What kind of ideas form the basis of the draft law on the general principles of organizing local self-management and the local economy in the Soviet Union? Is there anything new?

[Pivovarov] First and foremost it recognizes the sovereign right of the union and autonomous republics to themselves decide the forms and methods of resolving most problems relating to the organization of local self-management and the local economy.

It also offers a new perception of the actual concept—the anatomy, if you like—of local self-management. It combines local soviets, labor collectives, social organizations, and citizens' formations and movements. Its economic base must consist of the natural resources in the assigned territory, the property of enterprises conducting economic activity in that territory, and also citizens' personal property.

The draft introduces a new concept: the territorial collective. This is a socialist, self-managing community invested with its own powers, rights, and responsibilities ensuring that tasks connected with the socioeconomic and cultural development of the territory within its jurisdiction are resolved on the basis of a combination of local and general national interests. This community will have its own collective property consisting of property transferred to it free by the state and also the property of soviets and other organs of local self-management created or acquired by them.

Furthermore, the new principles of organizing local self-management consolidate the independence and self-sufficiency of local soviets, which protects them against the diktat of higher organs. It also defines a new approach to forming the budget of these soviets. In particular, it proposes including in this budget in full the income tax collected from working people living in the soviet's territory.

However, there is no need to relate the contents of the draft law. It was approved by the USSR Supreme Soviet on the first reading and will be published in IZVESTIYA and the local press for public discussion. We would like as many people as possible to take part in this discussion. We ask the Supreme Soviet presidiums of the Union and autonomous republics, the executive committees of kray and oblast soviets, and also the editorial offices of newspapers and journals, particularly in outlying districts, to be prompt in sending us the generalized results of this discussion. Once we have studied every proposal and observation, we will submit the draft law to the Supreme Soviet for a second reading.

[Buzhkevich] What else has the committee been busy with during the current session, Nikolay Dmitriyevich?

[Pivovarov] Naturally, we have been mainly concerned with the drafts of the most important laws discussed by our parliament. We have made a series of observations on the draft state plan and budget for next year, particularly on the methods used in their preparation. We have devoted a great deal of time to studying and discussing draft laws of an economic nature: on ownership, land, the lease system and lease relations, taxation, socialist enterprise, and others. What is more, the committee has prepared draft laws on mandates for USSR people's deputies and on the procedure for their recall, as well as proposals on the annual replacement (rotation) of Supreme Soviet members, and it is actively involved in work on the status of people's deputies in the USSR and the standing orders for the work of their congress and the USSR Supreme Soviet. In short, we have a lot of work. We just have to try to keep abreast of it all. But that is precisely what the voters expect of us: responsive and responsible lawmaking. Which is borne in mind by many people's deputies.

[Buzhkevich] I wish you all success!

Supreme Soviet Decree on Co-op Activity

904A0052A Moscow EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA in Russian No 44 Oct 89 p 3

[Decree of the USSR Supreme Soviet signed by M. Gorbachev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, Moscow, the Kremlin, 17 Oct 1989: "On Putting the Trade-Purchase Activity of Cooperatives in Good Order

and Regulating the Prices for Commodities (Services) Sold by Cooperatives to the Population and to Organizations"]

[Text] Having reviewed the statement of the AUCCTU [All- Union Central Council of Trade Unions] and the proposal of a group of USSR People's Deputies about shutting down individual cooperatives and regulating prices for commodities (services) sold by cooperatives to the population and organizations, the USSR Supreme Soviet decrees:

1. To confirm the immutable line of the USSR Supreme Soviet on the development of the cooperative movement and the creation of conditions that are stable and equal to those of state enterprises in the economic management of all cooperatives that operate according to the law. To require that all state organs adhere strictly to the laws on cooperatives.

To consider it a contradiction to the basic principles of cooperative activity to utilize the difficult situation that has taken shape in the consumer market for speculative activity and the acquisition of unwarranted profits. For the purposes of eliminating the practice of increasing prices for commodities (services) and the acquisition of unwarranted profits, to consider it necessary to regulate individual types of cooperative activity.

2. In accordance with Article 3 of the USSR Law "On Cooperatives in the USSR," to prohibit cooperatives from conducting trade-purchase and middleman activity associated with cornering industrial and food commodities and their resale in the retail and wholesale network of state trade and consumer cooperatives. To prohibit enterprises of the state retail trade and consumer cooperatives from selling the indicated commodities to cooperatives.

Cooperatives are to cease the indicated activity and by 1 January 1990 complete calculations according to pertinent contracts or to cancel them according to established procedure, and also resolve the question on reprofiling or liquidating the cooperative. The executive committees of the local soviets of people's deputies are to provide assistance to these cooperatives as needed

3. To grant the right to the soviets of people's deputies to establish maximum price levels (markups) on basic necessity commodities (services) that are produced and sold by cooperatives. The decision on this is being brought to the attention of the population. A list of the indicated commodities (services) and the maximum permissible level of prices and markups for them, with respect to the pertinent state retail prices, are determined in a process stipulated by legislation of the union republics, taking into account the prices of raw materials acquired by the cooperatives.

Maximum price levels (markups) are not applied if, according to legislation, the commodities (services) are subject to sale by cooperatives according to centrally established prices.

Cooperatives, whose activity is conducted in two or more oblasts or republics, sell their commodities (services) to the population at prices that do not exceed the maximum permissible price level set by the soviet of people's deputies at the place of sale of the commodities (services).

Cooperatives that acquire commodities through import sell these commodities to the population at prices that do not exceed the price levels established for similar commodities by the appropriate state organs.

If a cooperative sells commodities at prices that exceed the indicated level, that cooperative pays the unjustifiably acquired profit and a fine to the local budget stipulated by Article 19 of the USSR Law "On Cooperatives in the USSR."

4. Control over the prices (tariffs) applied by cooperatives is conducted in accordance with laws in force through state inspections (sectors) of price control by price formation organs in cooperation with the local financial and bank organs, groups and posts of workers and people's control, and trade union organizations and public consumers.

5. The Procuracy of the Union SSR [Soviet Socialist Republics] and the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs will take immediate measures to ensure legality in the activity of cooperatives and to protect consumer rights.

Procuracy organs will protest cooperative documents which conflict with legislation on cooperatives that are published by ministries, state committees and departments, executive and managerial organs of local soviets of people's deputies, and organs of state arbitration, people's control, enterprises, establishments, and organizations.

To decisively stop the illegal cornering by cooperatives of commodities in the trade network, the sale of commodities at increased prices, and other illegal cooperative deals. Insure the consistent application of measures established by law to cooperatives and officials of state and public organizations that perform such activity. In conformity with civil legislation, to take measures to confiscate everything that was acquired through illegal deals.

6. The USSR Council of Ministers will implement the necessary measures in a 2-month period to strengthen financial-banking control over the activity of cooperatives in the sphere of production and services and to strengthen tax inspections. The USSR Ministry of Finance and its local organs will ensure the efficient work of the tax services, accounting for all income of cooperatives, and full payment of taxes by them.

7. The USSR Council of Ministers and the USSR Central Union of Consumer Societies will take measures that preclude the possibility of the sale of commodities

acquired by organizations and enterprises of the consumer cooperative system in state wholesale and retail trade at prices that are set too high.

Political & Social

Gorbachev 15 Nov Speech at All-Union Student Forum

PM1611160389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
16 Nov Second Edition pp 1-3

["The Cause of Perestroyka Needs the Energy of the Young: M.S. Gorbachev's Speech at the All-Union Student Forum 15 November 1989"—PRAVDA headline]

[Text] Dear friends, on behalf of the Communist Party Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Soviet Government, I ardently and cordially welcome you, the delegates of the student forum. In your person, I greet all our students, young men and young women of the country of soviets. We attach great significance to this meeting with you. Recalling the years of my youth and my period in the Komsomol, including the student Komsomol, where I had occasion to busy myself directly with Komsomol affairs in various capacities at Moscow state University all 5 years, one thing has stuck in my mind, seemingly simple but bearing great significance. Most of all, my friends and I both protested and were dissatisfied at that time, when you are spoken to not as equals but with condescension and a pat on the shoulder. I think that this should be excluded entirely from our life and from our society which is renewing itself.

Therefore, let's start with the main thing, perestroyka: Why it is essential, its thrust and intention, ways of implementing it, and where we are right now. Naturally, in this context it will be possible to better understand the role and place both of the students and of all of our young people at this crucial stage in the development of Soviet society. The party sees in young people an active force for the revolutionary renewal of the country. Today's generation of young people is also deeply interested in the success of perestroyka, perhaps even more, I assume, than others. This is understandable, since it is not only your present but also your future fate. How your lives turn out will depend on this. I think that none of the problems which young people have can be resolved outside the general context of perestroyka.

I.

First of all I want to let you in on our plans and approaches, because otherwise it is difficult to make things out and to understand today's situation in society, which is very uneven—one could say complex, in certain respects critical and contadictory. Perestroyka has arrived almost at the 5-year mark in its history. The process of revolutionary transformation of society which was begun by the April 1985 plenum and its decision is proceeding. Moreover, it is acquiring more and more new forms and an increasingly broad scale and depth, intruding into all spheres of the life of society and in essence embracing the interests of all social levels of society.

I must say frankly—and I must say this, for it is important for understanding the policy of perstroyka, its concepts, and ideas —that at the beginning we supposed that it would only be a matter of correcting certain deformations in the public organism, of removing certain defects of that system which took shape in the preceding decades, and of stepping up the country's social and economic development. You remember that at that time the slogan, acceleration of the country's social and economic development, was thus formed and put forward. That was the first step in perestroyka. But we soon felt that we could not make do with measures of a cosmetic nature. The explanation of the fundamental reasons for the situation which had taken shape in the country led us to a deeper analysis of the entire path travelled by the country, our people, and all generations. In order to understand the nature of today's processes, to predict future and distant prospects for our society, to work out political guidelines for this very responsible stage of revolutionary tranformations in the country, it was necessary to understand the society in which we live.

At first glance, everything would seem to be quite simple: We live in this society, we know it, everything is clear. Yet this turned out to be the most difficult task. Furthermore, we had to look around ourselves and attentively study the processes taking place in the world under the influence of the scientific and technical revolution and global problems, and taking account of the fact that time itself had put on the agenda the question of the survival of modern civilization. Thus, we came to the concept of perestroyka as a revolutionary renewal of socialism and of our entire society; thus did we come to the new political thinking, the essence of which is recognition of the priority of universal human values, the mutual links and interdependence of the present-day world, and the growing integration and unity of that world in all its contradictions. We took a fresh look at socialism as an organic part of modern civilization. We must look boldly and openly into the future. In building our future, we are basing ourselves upon the gigantic intellectual and moral potential of the socialist idea of building a humane and democratic society, which is for us linked with the theory of Marxism-Leninism.

I would not, however, wish to limit myself to generalized declarations in this regard. History has keenly raised the question of the vitality of the socialist idea itself, of the socialist form of democracy and humanism. It is no longer enough to affirm that socialist ideas correspond to the logic of the historical process, and the aspirations, the centuries-old aspirations, of people striving for a reasonable, humane, and just society. Voices can be heard alleging that the socialist idea is an artificial, intellectually speculative construct, and therefore has no future; that the theory of Marxism which apprehended and substantiated it has failed to justify itself, since it is responsible for the crisis of our society. Such voices,

incidentally, can be heard not only in the camp of the opponents of socialism, but increasingly frequently in our country, during turbulent debates and discussion on the past, present, and future of the country.

What is important for us here is an understanding of the fundamental ideas of the founding thinkers of our teaching. Marx apprehended the socialist idea and cast aside the utopian form of it, and with the aid of science made a prognosis of socialism as a natural product of the development of civilization and the historical creativity of the working class and all working people.

At the same time, Marx clearly distinguished socialism from crude levelling, "barracks" communism, as he called it. He connected the establishment of a new society with the highest development of material production, democracy, and the individual. For us such a Marxist interpretation of the socialist idea is the greatest social and spiritual value. At its center is man, his all-round intellectual, moral, and physical development in a society freed from exploitation and oppression, and guaranteeing the possibility for the free manifestation of the capabilities of the individual. We see no rational grounds to give up the spiritual richness contained in Marxism. And the fact that it has been distorted, vulgarized, primitivized, and applied incorrectly, cannot in any way be grounds for giving up Marxism. We consider that in spite of the opinion of some latter-day theoreticians, social thought over the time that has elapsed has not in its basics and in the main surpassed the Marxist idea of the construction of a "realm of freedom" based on the people being in charge of material production and of their own social relations.

The founders of Marxism and the theory they created cannot bear the responsibility for the deformation of socialism in the years of personality cult and stagnation, or for the erroneous actions of this or that political figure. Our society is now actively and critically discussing not only the ideological and theoretical bases of socialism but also the lessons from the path travelled by our country. Different points of view are being expressed about the past. For all the sharpness and criticality of the discussions and the analysis of our past and of the current state of society, our people on the whole are affirming their devotion to the choice of October and the ideals of the October revolution.

At the same time, we come across attempts to portray the October revolution, and also the entire subsequent history of the country, as an error, a tragic accident which destroyed the natural course of events, which brought the people nothing but suffering. The party's view on this is well known.

Now I would just like to express a few ideas. We do not reject our history. We aspire to understand it on the basis of scientific analysis, the re-establishment of the full truth, and not the exchange of one half-truth or untruth for another half-truth. Our task is to highlight the full complexity and contradictoriness of the post-October processes, the great achievements, the distortions, the tragic mistakes, and the failures.

Now, as we are going deeper into the essence of our own history, it is becoming even more obvious that the October Revolution was not a mistake, for the real alternative to it was not a bourgeois democratic republic at all, as some would have us believe today, but an anarchic revolt and the bloody dictatorship of a military clique, a reactionary anti-people's regime. And, if you start analyzing the events from July 1917 until the very day when the October Revolution took place, you will remember that it happened precisely that way. The October Revolution was not an accidental event but a great historic breakthrough, into the future, of world-wide significance and a claim for solving social problems in the interests of the people and creating social conditions for supreme material and spiritual progress, and for engaging the working people in the process of conscious social creative activity.

I ask for your attention to what I am saying for one reason. We need to comprehend, in a very clear-cut manner the basic and main issues. If we fail to comprehend them, we will always get lost in details, we will constantly stumble and hit our head, and, the main thing, we will suffer agonies, because an individual who has no conclusions and guiding lines based on strict analysis is helpless.

The very first months, as well as the first years after October 1917, were filled with an intensive search for concrete forms of organizing society on socialist principles, which was conducted by Lenin and the Bolsheviks. Please recall at least such a work by Lenin as "The Next Tasks of Soviet Power" which appeared in early 1918. In the time that followed, under the influence of the directives that were propagated by Stalin, and that long outlived him, the exploratory nature of Lenin's post-October works were underrated and played down in our country. Changes in Lenin's views on the construction of socialism were concealed, for these changes allegedly could have been evaluated as weakness. But, in fact, Lenin's quest was a sign of strength, not of weakness, the strength of Marxism as creative teaching. The assertion that—nearly from the first days of the Revolution—Lenin had an elaborate program for the construction of socialism in our country has become a dogma. In fact, Lenin drew it up gradually, by combining theoretical tenets of Marxism with living practices and real processes. Many things had to be clarified or even radically revised. At a certain stage of the revolution the emphasis was on direct distribution, forced labor, strict record-keeping and control—these measures were an integral element of the policy of war communism.

However, with the end of the Civil War, it became clear to Lenin that that policy had exhausted itself, that to lead the masses to socialism, relying just on the enthusiasm evoked by the revolution, is not possible, that it is necessary to bring into action material interest and the related economic mechanisms of the production of

goods and the market. Proceeding from this, the main directions of the movement of Soviet society were defined in a new way, the most important of which was the courageous proclamation of the New Economic Policy, [NEP], a policy which went against the grain of dogmatic directives and the opinions which had grown up in the party environment. It was a dramatic situation when the closest supporters, those who had traversed that path, the path of preparing for the revolution and of carrying it out, came out against Lenin's ideas of the NEP.

Lenin gives a clear answer to the question of whether power should have been taken in October. That should be remembered now, since that question is in the center of the discussion now too. Or should power have been renounced after the Civil War in connection with the fact that proletarian revolutions did not occur in other countries, as had been counted on. Lenin decisively substantiated the need to make use of the power of the proletariat for creating, as rapidly as possible, the economic and cultural prerequisites for the transition to socialism; in other words, to do under Soviet power what capitalism and bourgeois democracy should have carried out. In the Leninist cooperative plan, the task of bringing the small producer into association with socialism was closely linked with the idea of cultural revolution, with changing people's whole way of life. In the last analysis, the elaboration of Lenin's program of transition to socialism, as he himself noted, took the form of a fundamental change in the whole view of socialism. Unfortunately, these profound Leninist ideas and approaches were ignored subsequently, or else they were grossly distorted in the course of Stalinist industrialization and collectivization.

But the question arises, why did Stalin succeed in imposing his program and his methods on the party and on the whole of society? That is the key question. The evaluation of our history and understanding of the character of our present society stems directly from its answer.

Stalin and his closest circle played cleverly on the revolutionary impatience of the masses, on the utopian and levelling tendencies which are inherent in every mass movement, on the striving of the vanguard, of the party itself to reach the long- awaited aim. The search which was historically necessary after Lenin to find forms and methods for constructing a new society turned into a fierce ideological and political struggle. All this greatly narrowed down the possibilities for creative discussion of the problems and alternatives and led to a unification which left no room for diversity of opinions and views on the basis of Marxist theory.

I think that we should remember today this lesson gained from historical experience. A concept of socialism became implanted in the public consciousness which from the beginning provided the justification for its command and administrative form. Contrary to Lenin's views of socialism as the result of the living creativity of the people, views were cultivated according to which socialism is created by "decree from above." Theory was to fulfill a distorted ideolological function, to support the illusion of the correctness of the political line which was being conducted, to justify what was done in practice, describing it as the consummate model of socialism which was allegedly in accord with Marxist principles.

One should not over-simplify anything here. The truth is that the people were inspired by the initial idea of socialism and believed that it was creating a new society. The ideas of the classics of Marxism-Leninism and the slogans and impulses of October continued to live in the people's consciousness. People measured their actions by them. In spite of all the deformations, the people were deeply committed to the ideas of October, preserved deep in their consciousness the humanistic understanding of socialism and whenever possible tried to give it rein. This imbued with lofty social meaning the life of whole generations which did so much to transform the country and which underwent vast burdens and deprivations. We who are living today must understand this very well. We must not permit negativism toward what was done by the preceding generations. This is where the truth lies.

But, of course, the deformations of socialism could not fail to tell on both the socialist idea itself and the way it was perceived by the masses, for the humanist content of socialism was impoverished and distorted. This could not fail to deform the system of its values and had a negative effect on the entire appearance of society, political, and public institutions and their functioning. The Stalinist distortions led to the loss of the main thing in the Marxist-Leninist concept of socialism—the concept of man as the aim and the highest value and not a means or a "cog."

A complex, contradictory, one could say, and tortuous process of our society liberating itself from errors and distortions of the past took place during the subsequent stages. But the administrative and command system held out and in certain respects even expanded and became stronger. This had painful consequences for society which finally was driven to a state of stagnation and brought to the brink of crisis. The above is not intended at all to deny that in those years, too, large-scale tasks of national economic importance and cultural tasks were being solved.

Achievements in conquering of space belong to that period. One should not underestimate the importance of the military parity that was achieved, though this required great efforts by the material and intellectual forces of society and of course had its effect on the implementation of social plans. But the inability of the command and administrative system to ensure present-day scientific and technical and social and economic progress was increasingly revealing itself as time went by. But it was precisely in those years that a new stage of

scientific and technical revolution started in the developed capitalist countries and a breakthrough towards new technologies occurred.

A powerful upsurge in the development of microelectronics, information science, and biotechnology resulted, in the full meaning of the word, in qualitative transformations in the progress of current civilization, including the production of food, consumer goods, services, and housing construction. Labor productivity literally grew by an order of magnitude in many industries, and this brought about colossal changes in people's entire way of life.

These revolutionary changes, though, touched us only tangentially, as it were. By and large, they involved the mastering of space and the military sphere. The underrating of the significance of the revolution which had taken place in science and technology seems to be the greatest mistake made at the time. As a result, we have remained as if we were still in the past technological epoch in several of the most important spheres of society's life, in the general civilization aspect, while the developed countries "of the West" have moved to another one, to the epoch of high technologies, fundamentally new interrelations between science and production, resource-saving, new materials, new forms of providing vital necessities for people, right up to everyday life.

That is why it is legitimate to refer to the period of stagnation as a time of missed opportunities which seriously harmed the progress of our society and socialism as a whole. In assessing the path covered since the October Revolution, we must, of course, approach this in a broad historical context. We cannot say the revolution fulfilled everything it promised. That is the situation. But it is also true that as a result of the revolutionary transformations over these 7 decades the Soviet Union has today become one of the states in the world that determines the historical destiny of mankind, and we have cause for pride.

Socialism has made a substantial contribution to the development of world civilization. We do not adhere to terms such as "two superpowers." But the very fact that world public opinion recognizes the substantiveness of our contribution is a telling one, and it does not just amount to military-strategic aspects. Behind this is the economic, scientific, and technical might of our country, the social development, innovation, and political influence on the processes taking place in the world. It is necessary to be aware of this and to make a proper assessment of it.

And now, in the present circumstances, when we are subjecting all of our history and all of our experience to fearless critical analysis, we must not allow our dissatisfaction with ourselves and the way we live today to be transformed into attempts to place in doubt our unquestionable attainments, recognized in the world, and the socialist choice itself. But this is indeed happening. There are many people today who are attempting to seek the roots of our ills and difficulties in the origins and principles of socialism, not in the distortions that were committed and in departures from it.

The CPSU today also returns to the origins and principles of the revolution, to the Leninist ideas about the construction of a new society—not to debunk them but to assume full responsibility for the cause of the revolution, for its promises, its achievements, and the debts it has incurred. And, most importantly, we need an analysis of our historical experience and of the present state of society, above all, in order to shape the future. It is on the basis of such an approach that the policy of restructuring has taken shape.

II.

The intention of the policy of restructuring is clear and unequivocal. Through restructuring, we want to give socialism a second wind and to unveil in all its plenitude the vast humanist potential of the socialist system. That is our premise as we consistently and unswervingly move onward. Every stage enriches us, and at the same time we get rid of that which has not proved itself in practice, and make the necessary adjustments.

On the basis of the concept of perestroyka that was drawn up we have arrived at major principled decisions on which our lives and the image and future of the country depend.

In the summer when we were celebrating the 90th birthday of Leonid Maksimovich Leonov, one of our outstanding writers and a classic of Soviet literature, I had a one-on-one meeting with him and we had a very interesting and substantive conversation. I was astonished by how attentively he followed everything taking place in the country, and I heard much that was interesting and useful from him. In particular, I should like to pass on one of his judgments, namely that now is a very crucial time because we must solve the most urgent and burning problems regarding our lives and our society. At the same time we must constantly remember that we are now accomplishing a breakthrough and taking decisions now which will determine the face of our country for tens or as he said for 100, 200 or perhaps 300 years ahead. This is a very profound thought. If it is given consideration, those whose job it is to adopt decisions—and that means the whole of our society—should be very responsible.

The general orientation of the decisions being adopted at the present time is aimed at eliminating the individual's alienation from ownership, power and the riches of culture. There you have the brief formula. It is aimed at returning the individual to society as the main dramatis persona. This is what accords with the Marxist concept and the Marxist view of socialism.

These processes are now developing ever more fully in our country and are gathering strength with each passing day. It is important to consolidate them, impart the

necessary dynamism to them and ensure that they yield results, however difficult it might be. It is necessary to keep moving along the path that we have embarked upon. The policy of renewal requires extraordinary decisions and appropriate responses to the questions that are posed by life itself. However, we can only make headway if one is confident about the main thing—the correctness of the basic idea and strategic goals. Of no less importance is having a clear understanding of the trends of development and appraising the nature of our difficulties. After all crucial stages in the history of society are always dramatic. We need to be well aware of this. This is the lesson of history, and we must assimilate it.

What characterizes the present situation in the country? It is above all the fact that in the development of the restructuring processes we have found ourselves at the peak of strain, as it were. The differences between the old and outdated and the new and developing have been exacerbated to the utmost. The former methods of management have weakened and lost their efficacy, but those that we now arming ourselves with have not yet begun working. This is having an effect on the solution of practical tasks connected with satisfying the needs of the working people and tackling scientific and technological problems. We are now, as it were, in a transitional period that is accompanied with the quest for and development of new forms of life but also with a difficult parting with the past and our own habits. Complex processes are under way in society and there is a confrontation between various tendencies. Frequently these take on extreme and mutually exclusive manifestations, ranging indeed from orthodox adherence to the old forms and conservative dogmas to a total rejection of all the experience of socialism, including the choice itself that was made in October 1917.

The difficulties of perestroyka give rise to a skeptical mood, to a lack of faith in the success of the transformations that have begun, in a certain section of the population. The doubt is even expressed as to whether it was necessary to undertake restructuring at all. What should one say on this subject? One should see beyond the external manifestations the deep-seated processes and understand their essence. First of all , it is not perestroyka that has brought about all today's difficulties or, at least, the greater part of them. The deformations of socialism that flourished for a long time were deeply embedded and camouflaged by the ideology and the practice of the period of stagnation. The outward appearance of prosperity was achieved at the expense of the wealth of the country, at the expense of future generations.

Perestroyka, which the party has begun, has revealed all the abscesses of society. Of course, there has been a considerable amount that has been neglected even in the years of perestroyka. Moreover, mistakes have been committed and perpetrated. This is true as well. But the main thing is that today the foundation of a new building is being laid, that the realistic preconditions for a major improvement in the situation in society are being created. It is important to understand that there will be results and in some things they have already started to manifest themselves. Over a period of 4 ½ years we have covered an enormous distance in the area of democratization, in the development of glasnost, and in the sphere of production relations. The psychology of people has changed qualitatively. Their civic commitment to state and social matters has been aroused. A deep reform of the political system has become a reality of life. In its first stage the new central bodies of authority and administration have been formed and have begun to function.

Despite all the shortcomings of this process, we can, on the whole, speak of a major step in the rebirth of the true power of the soviets. We have now entered a new, second stage of political reform, in the course of which the renewal of the whole system of bodies of state authority in republics, in oblasts, in the towns and in the countryside, will take place. In the same way the principle of the full authority of the soviets will be implemented on all levels of the leadership and management of society. And this will have enormous significance for ensuring the success of the policy of perestroyka and in resolving the problems that have accumulated. We have set about radical transformations in the economy, linked with changes, above all, to relationships of ownership. It is a matter of creating economic relations which will allow, as I have said, the isolation of the worker from the means of production to be overcome, and allow us to go on to the creation of a full-blooded socialist market, to develop genuine, business-like competitiveness and enterprise, to eliminate the monopolistic ways, the regionalism, and the egoism of the enterprise. We are returning to a Leninist understanding of the role of cooperation in socialist building and are implementing a policy aimed at the development of varied forms of the organization of collective production. Today's meeting prompts me too to reflect together with you on the dialectic of continuity with our past and breaking with it, on how to separate the wheat from the chaff, to determine what we will take with us into the future and what for us is not acceptable.

What is unacceptable is everything that is connected with the Stalin period and stagnation; with administrative-command arbitrariness and the violation of socialist legality and the standards of universal morality; with total centralization, political authoritarianism, and the suppression of dissent; with living at others' expense and leveling-down; and with the corruption and embezzlement of public funds. We are parting company with blind obedience, apathy, and indifference.

However, we take with us from the past all that is of value in our revolutionary heritage, all that is heroic and of universal significance. First and foremost, the ideals of Great October, on the banners of which were inscribed the demands, achieved by the peoiple through their suffering: All Power to The Soviets! Factories and

Mills to the Workers! Land to the Peasants! Peace to the Peoples! and Free Development to Each Nation!

We take with us a Marxism-Leninism purged of the accretions of dogmatism, scholasticism, and opportunistic interpretations. We are returning to its origins and are creatively developing it so as to go forward. Our party was and remains the party of Lenin. I should like to stress that particularly, since attacks on Lenin as a theoretician and politician have recently grown stronger. Remaining true to Lenin's teaching means developing its creative spirit, enriching it with new conclusions and theses, and rejecting, once and for all, the canonization of formulations dictated by a specific situation and belonging totally to their own time. That is why spouting quotations is absolutely unacceptable as a way of arguing in favor of any position adopted by a particular speaker.

Apart from that, one of the main lessons that the Marxist classics have taught us is the capacity for ideological self-renewal on the basis of the experience accumulated, since the slightest movement in theoretical thinking and the transformation of these theoretical conclusions into policy have immediately been seen by a certain section of our society as revision of Leninism and Marxism.

In short, we are for a Lenin who is alive, rather than for a Lenin who is covered by the gloss of anthologies. Lenin could not provide the answers to all the questions arising from later social development. We must seek these answers ourselves, guided by the spirit of Leninism, the style of Lenin's thinking, and the method of dialectical cognition.

We are taking into the future the selflessness of all generations of Soviet people—of all the generations of Soviet people who broke free of the vicious circle of destitution and illiteracy and built up a powerful industrial country, who stood their ground during the years of war and achieved impressive successes in science and culture—their spiritual strength, historical optimism and love of their country.

I should like to stress also once again that ensuring the welfare and the all-around, free development of all the members of society constitute the central, leading idea and the supreme purpose of our activities. Man as the purpose of development in itself and as the yardstick of social progress—that is our ideal. The party is not rejecting and never will reject that communist ideal.

The process of mastering the idea of the revolutionary transformation of society is of course no simple matter. I would even say it is not painless, and I hope you will agree with this, inasmuch as all of life today is there for every one of us to see. After all, these transformations concern living people with their interests and needs, their accustomed ways, their views about things, and the world around them.

For all our achievements in the development of democracy, it is necessary to acknowledge that for the time being the initiative of submitting demands and ultimatums often prevails over the initiative of creative action and over the search for constructive solutions. A flood of meetings and strikes is at hand. That is also a reality. How is one to appraise all this?

I think that in such a contradictory course of events, a certain level of social conceptions about the current situation in the country and about the opportunities for getting out of it is manifesting itself. We are convinced that in the search for ways and methods of renewing the country it is necessary to proceed from reality, to see our society as it is, and to take into account what we have to endure through the difficult passage from the old to the new. This will require great efforts, intensive work, and resilience on everbody's part.

One has to act proceeding from a sober assessment of what is taking place and a scientific prediction of the near and distant prospects for our development. This is difficult but it is the only correct, feasible, and objectively necessary path and form of action.

There are now a great many people who are proposing simpler and easier solutions. I am talking about this because in our time quite a few "friends of the people" have already appeared offering "recipes for salvation." Some promise an immediate, quick, and complete cure. Others speak about restructuring, but think about something else, in essence, about preserving obsolete forms in the life of society, and, basically are braking the restructuring proceses under the slogan of defending the achievements of socialism. One has to understand all this, comrades, and you especially.

I can say one thing. Phraseology, pseudo-radical slogans, speculation on our difficulties, and political toying with the expectations of people may of course gain popularity at meetings but cannot get the country out of a crisis. I categorically insist on this conclusion. It is worth stating this again and again, not only to you, the young people, full of energy and thirsting for resolute actions, but to all who respond to the garish appeals and the irresponsible promises of quick changes. We cannot allow ourselves to be deluded by promises of quick and easy victories. We all must understand this well. This is not the first time that I have spoken about this and in the past few days I have spoken about it many times, but I am doing so because such an understanding has still not taken shape in society, comrades.

The most dangerous intoxication in politics is to be intoxicated by phraseology. We know well from history that on a number of occasions it has threatened many countries, including our own, with catastrophe.

Calculations aimed at preserving the old and stagnant ways are likewise dangerous and should be rejected. We cannot resolve the new tasks using the old approaches.

That, incidentally, was one of Lenin's ideas. He once said: do not try to solve new tasks using old methods.

Antisocialist, anti-Soviet, and nationalist and chauvinistic aspirations represent a serious danger to perestroyka. There are people who are inciting interethnic quarrels, civil disobedience, and extremist outbursts and who are trying to embark upon setting up parallel power structures. What is more, this is once again done under the slogan of implementing perestroyka more decisively. But it is not in this that decisiveness lies: decisiveness lies in the profundity of the transformations. By their actions these people are intensifying social tensions and imposing confrontation upon society, while covering up their ambitious intentions with widely broadcast declarations about the national good.

No one can be permitted to gamble with the destiny of the people and the destiny of the country in the name of satisfying their own ambitions and thirst for power. The time has come to declare this openly.

I say: both those who want to halt the process of perestroyka and transformations and to return us to the old forms of life and the regime of stagnation, and those who offer us extremism in policy, adventures, who are trying at present to find themselves a footing, a base in the working class, taking advantage of the working class's dissatisfaction with the current state of affairs on the food market and with the way the processes of perestroyka are proceeding, and who want to associate themselves with this—we must see all this and tell people bluntly where this is leading. Both these things... [changes thought] the return to the past is a historic dead end, and adventures mean chaos and shakeups. We must avoid them. The situation is so complex that it may be aggravated still further.

There is but one way to overcome the difficulties: consolidation and positive work on the part of all the healthy forces of society committed to the success of perestroyka and to attaining its goals. Happily, the majority of people in our society are already like that, comrades. Therefore these forces will not succeed in confusing us. Only in the conditions of consolidation can the energy awakened by perestroyka and the vast potential of the Soviet people be put fully into effect. I should, however, say bluntly that this process could drag on, unless we overcome the sort of inferiority complex present in part of society. Let no one take offense at this, neither in this hall nor beyond it. For it does exist, comrades. There is a lack of confidence in the potential possibilities of our order and in the material, scientific, technical, and intellectual potential we have at our disposal. We must overcome this psychological state and strengthen the spirit of our people. For only people strong in spirit will be up to resolving the huge and difficult task of renewing our society.

There are no grounds for depression and certainly not for panic. We have everything necessary in order to embark upon the broad road of the dynamic development of our society.

Incidentally, such a situation or similar ones have occurred in the life of many countries and peoples. Indeed, our own experience provides quite a lot of instructive examples in this respect. Yes, it is hard for us. But we now know better than we did yesterday what we have to do. We shall cope with the challenges that the times have thrown up. And we must not submit to the incantations of some of our latter-day prophets who foretell "inevitable disaster" for us, frightening people with civil war and coups and goodness knows what.

I think we must say this to our mass media too, to the communists, to the Komsomol members, to everyone who labors there. Let them too reflect on these ideas. We shall advance decisively, step by step. In this connection I should like to say that we have now approached the moment in the development of the current stage of perestroyka when we must put the question of speeding it up. Not so long ago, comrades, we could not put the question like that. Now such a question is not only vitally important—it was always essential for us—but today real possibilities are appearing.

What am I thinking of? We have given up, to a significant extent, administrative command methods of managing the economy and society, and this process has not yet ended. But it is quickly gaining speed. For this reason we have the task of introducing new methods of management more speedily, so that the transitional period from one system of management to another should be as brief as possible. This is a very painful period. That means that acceleration is needed. There are now firm prerequisites for this. We are entering the second stage of political reform, and this is introducing quite significant changes into the bodies of power and administration. But the main thing is that work is coming to an end on a whole package of legislative acts connected with forms of property and methods of managing the economy. For this reason we now need to define clearly the stage of speeding up economic reform. This is what we are engaged in now.

At the second Congress of People's Deputies, on the convening of which the Supreme Soviet had adopted a decision, these questions will be at the center of attention.

One more, not unimportant, argument in favor of speeding up economic reform. I ask you to regard this idea with attention. You realize that the policy of perestroyka is a system of interconnected revolutionary measures, and only if they are implemented as a package can one count on success in achieving the aims that have been set. But I think you also realize that in the process of transformation there can be stages, priorities, and this or that rate of change. In other words, there can be no question of complete synchronism. Nevertheless, perestroyka must advance consistently in all fields. One cannot permit a great gap in carrying out the intended mesures.

So we are now seeing that the rates of democratization, of political reform, of the politicization of society as a whole, are outstripping transformations in the economy.

This has led to the following: people, with the expansion of democracy and glasnost, have obtained new possibilities for stating their interests and for putting forward demands. In general this has to be welcomed since this strengthens the influence of the working people and their monitoring of perestroyka. But it is also clear that satisfying all demands of a social and economic nature is only possible on the basis of better organization of work, greater labor productivity and a new attitude to work. But for this, we now know, it is necessary to fundamentally change the attitude to property and the entire aggregate of production relations. It means that we must resolutely carry out economic reform and speed up this work. To this I can only add that we must normalize the situation with finances and on the consumer market, in the shortest possible time.

It is envisaged to carry out the first steps in this regard within the framework of the State Plan for the Social and Economic Development for 1990. A considered complex of measures aimed at resolving this topical problem of perestroyka will be presented by the government to the second Congress of USSR People's Deputies. I can tell you one thing: The party Central Committee and the USSR Supreme Soviet and Government are aware of the real situation in society, and have evaluated it correctly, and are taking and will continue to take measures to improve the socioeconomic situation in the country.

As you can see, there is a vast amount of restructuring work ahead of us. We must think in the new way and act dynamically, taking into account the large scale of the tasks to be resolved.

In order to change society we must change ourselves. Our perestroyka, as it primarily a revolution of the mind. This is a most important prerequisite for the success of perestroyka, but we must understand that we will not be able to acquire our new understanding, our new ideas and our new attitude to life and to work from books, from discussions, with all of their fruitfulness and significance. We can become different only by taking part actively in all of the transformation processes, going firmly along the road of perestroyka.

There is the dialectic! In order that perestroyka may happen, we must change. in order for us to change we must take part actively, become involved in all of the processes, and be active on the roads of perestroyka.

It is by basing ourselves on this understanding that we should act at this crucial time. I will be repeating myself but I will say once more that the most important thing is that we must know where we are going. We should all firmly proceed from the premise that the command-administrative system and the forms of organization of society connected with it have practically exhausted themselves and do not contain within themselves the internal stimuli to perform the tasks of socialist renewal in the country. This is something we should all understand, for I feel that in society, in certain strata, there is a nostalgia for the past methods of work. Hence the talk about a "firm hand" and a "firm authority," hence the dissatisfaction with the fact that instability has appeared. But, can revolutionary changes really take place without also being accompanied by unstable phenomena? No. I think that in our country, nevertheless, in society, a consensus has taken shape regarding the fact that we remain devoted to the choice of October, that our road is socialism, but a socialism enriched with our modern experience and the experience of modern civilization.

Comrades, in the general discussion on the further development of society, one of the central questions to emerge has been that of the party. We base ourselves on the fact that the socialist renewal of the country cannot proceed without reforming and renewing the party itself, the political vanguard of society. We are for a broad discussion of the question of restructuring in the party. We have already essentially embarked on the pre-congress discussion. We need it very badly, we need it to gain a deeper understanding and comprehension of the new role of the CPSU in modern conditions.

Therefore, we reject attempts to use such a discussion to weaken the party, to represent it as a stronghold of conservatives and as almost the main brake on perestroyka, to identify the CPSU as some kind of apparatus alienated from the people, to introduce dissent and sow uncertainty in its ranks. Anyone who is free of prejudice and who is capable of judging objectively cannot help but admit that, even today in this difficult situation, with dissenting opinions, a variety of interests, it is the party, it is the CPSU, that acts as the integrating force of perestroyka. it showed political initiative on the all-around renewal of society. It did not shrink from sharp self-criticism. It resolutely dissociated itself from anything that damaged the development of our society and socialism. It was this principled attitude that enabled it to propose a progressive policy, to enlist the support of the people and set the restructuring processes in motion. No one can cast doubt on the creative contribution of millions of communists to the practical advance of perestroyka. However, obviously, the pace and dynamism of the changes are such that the party must act more actively and consistently. Society needs clear, distinct political reference points and this can only be done by a political party which is appropriate to the present time.

It is precisely this that prompted the decision to bring closer the time for holding the next congress and to hold a large-scale discussion on topical party policy issues and on the organization of its practical functioning.

Of course, establishing an atmosphere of true democracy in the party, that it to say, of the power of the party masses, should, in my view, become the aim of the transformation of relations within the party. It is necessary to create the conditions in order for each communist to be able to really influence by his view, by his position,

the drafting of the party's policy, and the formation of all elective bodies of the party. In this way the communists' alienation from the life and activity of their political organization will be overcome.

We are witnesses of the stormy process of the politicization of all public life, of all social strata. And the party must be open —this I want to emphasize especially—to a constructive dialogue with all movements which are coming out in favor of perestroyka, which have a stake in its success, and which are making their contribution to achieve this success. This approach will enable the party to fulfil its role as political vanguard, to unite all the healthy forces for the sake of the renewal of socialism. This work can be successful only under conditions of large-scale democracy, glasnost, respect for the view of each communist, and a free, large- scale discussion—although, of course, for all the pluralism of views and opinions on the problems of our development, there are, for communists, fundamental, abiding values.

The CPSU's program document is now being drawn up. After discussion, evidently early next year at the Central Committee plenum it will be submitted for discussion as a platform of the Central Committee for the 28th party congress. The present understanding of the principles of forming the mutual relations and activity of the CPSU and of all its links must be elaborated and enshrined in the Statutes. In other words, we need new rules. The next party congress must equip the party and the whole society with a carefully regulated political action program at a crucial stage of perestroyka.

II.

Comrades! The logic and essence of perestroyka itself demand a vast increase in standards: standards of world outlook, politics, technology, production, human intercourse, ecology, law and art.

I want to quote here the words of our remarkable scientist and teacher Kliment Arkadyevich Timiryazev. Here they are: "What does the evolution of mankind teach in its immediate past? In what direction is it moving? What force is pushing forward as a most important factor of mankind's future? Science and democracy."

These fine words are totally applicable to our perestroyka. Without democracy reason will not be supreme. In turn, democracy cannot become firmly established without science, education and culture as the principal intellectual supports of life and so its advantages will not be realized. Indeed, you and I now sense how we are lacking in general, and above all in political culture now when the processes of democratization are under way in our society.

The achievements of our science and education are vast. But another thing is also obvious. Over recent decades attention to these things has subsided. The attitude that education is something secondary and subordinate to the needs of material production has taken root. Is it not because science and education have lagged behind that production itself has begun to lag behin? The long disregard of the development of education now often results in professional helplessness, stagnation in several spheres of science, and dogmatism and scholasticism in assessing social phenomena. A great deal of harm has been done to society also as a result of lack of ability and often of the overt reluctance to call for resources of talent and nonstandard thinking. That is still manifesting itself today. The level of the practical use of the fundamental achievements of science and knowledge can no longer satisfy us. That is why along with economic and political reforms, the restructuring of higher and secondary education is a powerful factor in the forward movement of society.

Today, positive yet contradictory tendencies have evolved in the implementation of educational reform. Its content is being renewed. The provision of incentives for pedagogical work is being stepped up. Additional resources have been directed to this area. Thus, it has been possible to increase capital investment for these purposes by a further R2.5 billion from centralized sources over the 3 years of the 5-year plan. However, I will say right away that a considerable part of this has unfortunately not been put to use and has not been brought into play. Serious work is being carried out to develop effective interaction between higher education institutions and enterprises and scientific institutions in the training of cadres. However, it should be said outright that the mechanism of integrating higher education, production and academic science, and of combining their interests with regional needs has not yet begun to work properly. This is holding up the movement of our society.

Of course, reform of general educational, vocational, and higher education is not some kind of onetime effort. It is particularly important here to guarantee the constant development and renewal of the whole educational system in accordance with the demands of the quickly changing times.

Society has an interest in ensuring that the creative thought of every person working in that sphere, of every student should seek ways to improve the process of study and should propose new and original solutions. We are awaiting serious recommendations on that account from your forum, too.

Now, it already has been generally recognized what an unprecedented challenge is being delivered to contemporary education by the scientific and technical revolution. Nevertheless, the measures taken in the sphere of education up until now have not yet led to large-scale and profound changes. Moreover, over the last few years, the gap between the USSR and developed countries in the assimilation of new high, and in the first place, information technologies, based upon the broad use of the lastest achievements of science has even increased. The world is on the threshold of a new information-technology [informatisirovannoye] society. We have to recognize that, to

recognize that any delay in that direction of the development of society is equal to a strategic defeat. Moreover, if we continue to develop at the previous rates, we run the risk of hopelessly lagging behind the world scientific, technical, and social progress. We have set about practically implementing the national program as our first priority as far as the development of electronics and computer technology is concerned. Despite all the difficulties, in the present 5-year plan R8.3 billion has been allocated to these aims as compared to the R3 billion in the past, in the previous 5-year plan. In the upcoming 13th 5-year plan, estimates show that we must double these investments no matter what.

It will be perfectly appropriate to speak here about the importance of scientific and technical progress in achieving the goals of perestroyka. It is well known that, in terms of production of primary resources, we have attained great volumes and do not lag behind the developed countries. Incidentally, each time that I prepare for some routine foreign visit to one country or another, I am given economic data, comparisons between our country and the country where the visit is planned. I see that in the first part, where supplies and resources in those things which society has at its disposal is detailed, there are few who can compete with us. As soon as you get to the final product, the national income, there is a gap of enormous dimensions. In the indicators for utilization of those resources, we lag considerably behind the other developed countries, comrades. This has an effect on the final results of our economy and on the solution of social problems.

Much must be solved within the framework of the radical economic reform, which is directed toward reforming ownership relations and methods of economic management. We hope that as a result both labor collectives and each worker will be placed in conditions where they will have an interest in saving working time and material and financial resources. This will itself create powerful stimuli for the technical re-equipping of the sectors of the national economy on the basis of modern achievements in science and technology and the execution of a purposeful structural policy. By implementing a set of measures, we must strike a powerful blow against inefficient management, ensure a turnaround in our economy toward resource- saving, and completely overcome its spending-based character.

Just pay attention to these figures. With comparable dynamism in production of the national income—that is to say, the dynamism is approximately identical—consumption of fuel and power resources in the USSR from 1981 to 1988 rose by 20 percent; whereas it rose by just 5 percent in the United States, which advanced at the same rate as far as the national income is concerned; by 6 percent in Japan, and by 1 percent in the FRG. In other words, the same rate of growth in the national income was ensured with enormous saving of resources.

Calculating on the basis of $1 billion of gross national product, we now expend 23 percent more standard units of fuel and 2.3 times more ferrous metal than the United States. For each unit of food and other goods meant for consumption, we expend approximately 30 percent more agricultural raw materials. Inefficient use of primary resources leads to hypertrophied development of the extraction and raw-material industries, which demand more and more investment, to the detriment of industries directly producing consumer goods; it also diverts resources from the social sphere and violates the environment.

Therefore, we are faced with the paramount task of overcoming the technical and technological lag in many parts of the production apparatus; and resource-saving must now be made the key area in the whole of our scientific and technical policy.

We are counting on a great contribution from the country's higher education establishments, which have an enormous scientific potential, in solving this strategic task. Here too, there is a wide field of activity for young scientific workers, engineers, designers, economists, and student scientific societies.

Comrades! We proceed from the basis that Soviet science and education are an inalienable and integral part of general human culture. There is now every opportunity for a profound assimilation of up-to-date experience and an overcoming of our former isolation. During the years of perestroyka the exchange of students, postgraduates, and teachers with the world's leading universities has increased many times over. We favor the development of such contacts and the creation of international teaching establishments where instruction is given by world famous scholars, and the assignment of students to take a full or partial course of instruction abroad. All of this serves to draw together and to mutually enrich the peoples and to realize the priority of common human interests, and it accords with our practical tasks.

The command of the times is the formation of a high humane culture for future specialists. The particularly significant sciences are now turned directly toward man.

We know how concerned young people are about questions relating to social prospects and the meaning of life, the infinity of being, the eternal feelings of love, good, justice, honor, and dignity of the individual. All of these are intransient universal human problems and ideals, too. The man with high moral foundations will never sink to civic irresponsibility, nationalism and chauvinism, or trampling on the rights of other people. The genuinely cultured and educated man is first and foremost a citizen, a patriot, and internationalist.

Lively discussion is currently under way among students about the place of the humanities in the educational process. Various options are being expressed about further improving the study of Marxist-Leninist theory. The practical measures, of which you are aware, have been adopted takng account of this. This problem will be discussed at the forum. I would like to wish you that the discussions on this topic, this fundamental topic, may be

constructive and fruitful. Neglect of theory and of broad, humanitarian culture costs dear, as we now know from our own experience.

Interest in these subjects has now increased not just among specialists but indeed in all of our society, and this is natural. People want to understand more profoundly the society in which they live, the tasks and goals of perestroyka, and the destiny of man. Briefly, interest in these problems is to be observed throughout the entire world.

I cannot fail to touch on problems pertaining to the material base, the equipping of scientific and technical education, and the solution of the social problems of higher educational institutions' collectives. We do indeed understand the importance and the acuteness of these problems. Furthermore, in spite of all the difficulty and strain in the financial and social spheres, we have implemented a number of specific steps in this direction: As you know, the size of grants for some categories of students have been increased, as have the salaries of higher educational teaching staff and the wages of young specialists.

These are but the first steps. In accordance with instructions the State Planning Committee and the appropriate departments are drawing up proposals for improving the material position of students, including a general increase in the size of grants. We proceed on the basis that dispite all financial difficulties we must seek out funds to implement such measures, starting from 1991, and to lay them down in the 13th 5-year plan.

However, I hope that that is not the only subject in my address that has aroused your interest. [Commotion in hall]

We shall not manage to fully resolve all matters immediately and rapidly by using centralized funds. Therefore, possibilities need to be discovered to improve the material and everyday service provisions for students through other sources too: the implementation of contractual relations, the involvement of students in scientific developments, the fulfillment of economic contract scientific work, and the solution of a number of economic and national economic tasks.

We will see to it that the unfounded limitations for students which exist in this field are removed. Therefore, discuss this theme and make proposals.

The development of contractual relations between VUZs and enterprises will facilitate the solution of social issues and of matters relating to creating a modern, scientific, and technical educational base.

Of course, what is involved is the equipping of VUZs with new technology, but above all the use, under appropriate conditions, of the base of scientific and production organizations. We do have such experience in the country; it is necessary to move even more resolutely along the path of integrating VUZs, science, and production.

In this connection, it is appropriate to talk about the revival of the traditions, which have largely been lost, of major scientists and specialists in the country participating in teaching students. The legal issues, we think, have for the most part been resolved. If it is necessary to adopt certain additional measures, then it is necessary to do this, and immediately at that.

We all know, of course, that the student years are not only study and science, but also a full social life that becomes more intense each year. The party is in favor of the full involvement of young people in all the social processes. It is quite obvious that young people have their own specific interests and they must strive to implement them by themselves, by participating in the political process, without "interpreters," and by increasing their contribution to the transformation of society. I note with satisfaction that the student fraternity is trying to act in precisely this way, and indeed I think it was because the students have something to say to the party, the Supreme Soviet, the government, and the whole of society, that the forum opened today.

Well, there already are examples of specific, major initiatives. They are the adoption, at the proposal of the students, of the governemnt decision about their voluntary participation in gathering the harvest under different conditions; and the decision on questions relating to military training.

The organized student movement is gathering force today. The whole range is represented in the numerous student councils, societies of people from the same region, and public formation sharing a professional or cultural interest. However, do all the new organizational structures work to improve matters? Do they correspond with the increased need and aspiration of students to find themselves not only in professional but also sociopolitical activity? I think we must guard ourselves against the danger of dividing up and proliferating into groups and clubs, and of losing our image as a powerful force in our society and an educated, energetic force. I think that you need to discuss this and think about it. Your forum must find answers to these and other questions.

One of the problems that is now being discussed is the issue of the formation of an all-union student body. Should it be created or not? But that it for you to decide, comrades.

The main thing is to direct one's efforts into the channel of socially useful matters, for the benefit of perestroyka. The party is in favor of broad participation by all young people, and of course students, in the composition of soviets at all levels; of the creation of real opportunities for political growth of young people; and of their promotion to responsible posts in the apparatus. But comrades, under the conditions of democracy this is not now just

handed to you on a plate. But you, let me tell you frankly, you slept through the elections of the people's deputies of the USSR. I think you have now thoroughly awakened and will not allow yourselves to be left to one side at the next stage of political reforms.

I think that in working out of the whole complex of questions that are connected with the creation of the prerequisites for the real participation of the youth in the country's affairs, the Supreme Soviet Committee on Youth Affairs will have to play a great part.

In our conversation we cannot fail to touch on the situation in the Komsomol. There are now heated discussions going on in this very large political youth organization about what the Komsomol is to be like in our time. Perestroyka gives the Komsomol the chance to determine its role in soceity and the state better, and to revive the spirit of creative search and initiative. The main force for the renewal of the Komomsol is the Komsomol members themselves. Here it is important to tackle the business in a real way, getting rid of formalism and the ostentation that everyone is sick of and everything that fetters the initiative and energy of young people, and hinders the implementation of their stands as citizens, their participation in society's affairs.

I think that now, when the country is at the point of a historical breakthrough, when the fate of our society is being decided for many decades ahead, the Komsomol should find its place as a political organization for young people.

It should remain that very strike force that Lenin spoke about and show its initiative in everything.

Moreover, comrades, it is impossible to cross out the whole history of the komsomol, as it is impossible to cross out the history of the country. The history of the Komsomol is indissolubly connected with the selfless struggle for the cause of the October Revolution and socialist ideals. The Komsomol has done a lot to defend them and with an ardent aspiration to implement them. It is not the fault of the younger generations of different times that many things did not happen or turned out wrong. What matters is the good that was done by the previous generations of young people in our country is important. The cause of perestroyka needs the energy of the young. We are sure that the Komsomol will sort out the problems which have arisen and will make the correct decisions at its congress. I can say only one thing: We will be at your side at this responsible time as well.

We note with satisfaction that during the revolutionary years of perestroyka Soviet young people are warmly supporting the party's policy for a socialist renewal of society. We assess it on merit and hope that the contribution of the Komsomol, all the young women and young men of the country, to the revolutionary perestroyka will grow. I wish your forum great success.

Gorbachev Meets With Delegates

LD1511220689 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 15 Nov 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpts] [Announcer] The all-union students' forum opened in Moscow today. [video reportage by A. Barkhatov, S. Grigoryan, and V. Nikitin shows a large meeting in session, camera focuses on Gorbachev delivering a report, Ryzhkov seated on the rostrum next to unidentified official]

[Reporter] Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov participated in the forum, which gathered more than 1,500 delegates in the youth palace. Also present in the hall were Comrades Vorotnikov, Zaykov, Medvedev, Biryukova, Razumovskiy, and Manayenkov. [passage omitted]

Meetings with delegates to the forum were held during the interval of the plenary session. [video shows Gorbachev, Ryzhkov, and others, entering a foyer; cuts to show Gorbachev speaking to crowd during interval]

[Gorbachev] The only important thing is that for the first time we have proved to ourselves and to the whole world that socialism is a system which is capable of self-renewal, of normal and natural self-renewal, be it within the framework of discussions, struggle, and comparison of views but without head-on collisions, without blood, on the basis of democracy and glasnost. And this is what had to be proved. But there are now in our country those who, from this or that side, are nudging precisely toward this path. I think that our people should know that we must show endurance and adherence to our choice and all will materialize. Things are difficult for us, of course. [video cuts to show Gorbachev, Ryzhkov, and other officials viewing footwear exhibition] [passage omitted]

[Reporter] The all-union students' forum was last held 18 years ago, in 1971. Everything in the Great Kremlin Palace then opened and ended with long and loud applause and with big slogans. But now it seems the students have taken upon themselves specific actions. [passage omitted]

Exchanges With Students Reported

PM1611141389 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 16 Nov 89 p 1

[Unnamed TASS correpondent report comprising part of coverage of day 1 of Moscow All-Union Student's Forum: "Unscheduled Seminar Held During Forum Recesses. M.S. Gorbachev and N.I. Ryzhkov Answer Delegates' Questions"]

[Text] The following took part in the opening of the forum: M.S. Gorbachev, V.I. Vorotnikov, L.N. Zaykov, V.A. Medvedev, N.I. Ryzhkov, A.P. Biryukova, G.P. Razumovskiy, and Yu.A. Manayenkov.

The leaders of a number of ministries and departments, figures from science and culture, and representatives of public organizations were present here, in the hall of the Palace of Young People.

When the forum announced its first recess, Mikhail Sergeyevich, who had just finished delivering a speech lasting over 90 minutes, stepped down from the platform into the hall.

A youth of modest stature carrying a file of papers begged his attention. He introduced himself: He was Nikolay Senchenkov, secretary of the Smolensk State University Teacher Training Institute's All-Union Lenin Communist Youth League [Komsomol] committee.

"My question is a very serious one," he began, "about the state of the environment."

It transpires that the institute has an active students' environmental club which has collected a large amount of material, which was contained in the file held by the young man from Smolensk. Mikhail Sergeyevich listened to what he had to say and promised assistance in organizing a meeting where the material collected would be properly examined.

The conversation with the young people in the foyer was lively. A veritable spate of questions ensued.

"What did the students of the fifties, when you, Mikhail Sergeyevich, were studying at Moscow State University, think about?"

M.S. Gorbachev: Above all about the fact that independent life would be interesting. That feeling is no doubt characteristic of students at any time.

"Your generation—are they the children of the 20th Congress?"

M.S. Gorbachev: I would say that they are nevertheless the children of the war years too. The war left a sharp impression in our minds. We are better able than today's generation to compare what was then with what is now. That, I think, is our great advantage.

"Do you think the place young students have in our political system is adequate?

M.S. Gorbachev: I think that much still has to to be done here. Society needs to be sure that it is raising a reliable new generation which will assume full responsibility in the future.

"How do you see perestroyka in the next 5 years?"

M.S. Gorbachev: We need to put everything in its place during this time, since there is no going back. We have demonstrated to the whole world that socialism is a system capable of self-renewal—normal, natural self-renewal. But let it be within the framework of discussion and comparison of views, without head-on confrontation and blood, on the basis of democracy and glasnost. It is difficult for us, of course. But it was even more so when the fate of the state hung entirely by a thread. The question is different now, yet acute in its own way: Will our country figure among the developed, advanced, democratic states—standard bearers of civilization—or not.

"Mikhail Sergeyevich, we know that you started your family when a student. You are well aware of the problems facing a student family today. How do you regard the state's role at the present stage in tackling the problems affecting young students?"

M.S. Gorbachev: It seems to me that we should elaborate approaches to these questions, and not just to them, together with students and the leaders of higher educational institutions [VUZ]. In general the problem of the young family is very important socially. It is, in short, a statewide problem. It has its own specific features here which it is important to grasp and get relevant decisions adopted upon.

There was yet another meeting and yet another dialogue. Student Aleksey Novozhilov from Angarsk runs the risk of becoming famous: He does not believe in perestroyka. M.S. Gorbachev's reaction to this statement made in the midst of young people was interesting: He took the statement calmly. Yes, some people have lost their way in the Komsomol too. True, Mikhail Sergeyevich, did express surprise: How did it happen that a young man raised in a city that was born out of young people's enthusiasm does not believe in perestroyka. Clearly the reasons lie in the confusion and hesitation typical of some people in any revolutionary epoch.

Someone asked whether the experience of Eastern Europe, Western countries, and China could be expected to have an influence on activating our students.

M.S. Gorbachev: The activeness—political, professional, and civic—of our students will be primarily influenced by our perestroyka. I will go further and say that perestroyka is also having an impact in many respects on international life. The scale and significance of perestroyka is enormous not just for us.

"Will our forum, in your view, serve to stimulate greater activity in the whole of Soviet students' life?"

M.S. Gorbachev: I hope so.

The topic of strikes has been broached in our dialogues. It has been said, in particular, that there were young people among the strikers in the Kuzbass and that students of the oblast gave them support. Mikhail Sergeyevich reminded them that he had expounded his position in the Supreme Soviet. I think that we came to the right decisions. The general secretary reminded them of the vast losses that the country and the entire people are suffering as a result of the stoppage of work.

N.I. Ryzhkov joined in the conversation. He specified that the strikes had already cost the country around R8 billion. I am asked, the chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers said, about material provision for students and

about the creation of a modern material and technical base for educational institutions. But where are these billions to come from when we have such unforeseen losses? There is a point beyond which one should not go. This should be remembered by all those defending corporate interests.

Mikhail Sergeyevich stopped at the Leningrad Textile and Light Industry Institute stand. Olga Astashkina, a postgraduate at the institute, informed him of the results of students' scientific research, which include the following: Threads and fibers have been created and products made from them which have a valuable application in medicine, biology, and water and air purification. The stand was displaying an instrument in which seven overseas companies had shown an interest.

M.S. Gorbachev showed great interest in the conditions in which students are carrying out their work and whether the institute's facilities were adequate for this.

Mood at Forum Described

PM1611090389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Nov 89 First Edition p 1

[O. Matyatin and V. Ryashin report: "The Whole Country and All Alma Maters. Reportage from the All-Union Students' Forum"]

[Excerpt]

An all-Union students' forum began its work in Moscow's Palace of Youth 15 November, attended by more than 1,600 delegates representing the country's higher and secondary specialized education establishments.

Comrades M.S. Gorbachev, V.I. Vorotnikov, L.N. Zaykov, N.I. Ryzhkov, A.P. Biryukova, G.P. Razumovskiy, and Yu.A. Manayenkov took part in the forum's work.

Leaders of ministries and departments, the All-Union Lenin Communist Youth League [Komsomol] Central Committee, and the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions [AUCCTU], and eminent scientific and cultural figures were also present in the hall of the capital's Palace of Youth.

The forum participants warmly greeted the speech by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet (the text of the speech and the replies to students' questions will be published in our next issue).

The forum is expected to continue its work until the weekend. Delegates have to discuss a large package of problems perturbing the future specialists.

Today we publish our first reportage from the forum.

It is hard to disagree with the poet who said: "You have to be young to accomplish great deeds." The only point is, does every era offer the younger generation an opportunity to perform its true mission, to fully express itself? We are still not too far away from the years when society's increasing alarm about the growing generation was placated by parade-ground speeches, theatrical reports, and orchestrated marches. A different life, a natural life was of course going on along parallel tracks, and it offered room for unfeigned romanticism and serious work alike. Nonetheless, let us not try to be too smart: Young people's social role in our country was very often reduced to just one thing—their main role was to take up and respond to calls and orders. The dominance of authoritarian monologue did not in any way promote harmony in relations between the older and younger generations, and was this not the source of the infantilism and conformism of which young people are at times accused?

Now is a time of dialogue; young people's voice can be heard and is heeded, and it cannot be otherwise: After all, perestroyka was launched primarily for the sake of those who will step into the next millennium. This is the initial impression from Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's speech delivered at the all-union students' forum yesterday.

Here is another impression: The state's youth policy is taking shape in the country, and it is founded on realistic analysis of the younger generation's problems and quest for effective ways to solve them. Let us also add this: A courageous quest.

The formerly prevalent stereotype of a condescending attitude toward youth, of formal pat-on-the-back tutelage, is receding into the past. Young people are being offered dialogue on an equal footing. All who were in the hall of the capital's Palace of Youth yesterday witnessed the unconstrained and keen conversation which M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet and N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, conducted with young people, replying to forum delegates' questions and briefing the students on the country's fundamental worries along the path of perestroyka.

There is hardly any need to speak of what it cost the country to plan increases for stipends to higher education establishment [VUZ] and technical college students in the harsh conditions of a budget deficit. This is a fact which, in parallel with many similar facts, testifies that the party—even in the most difficult conditions—strives to pursue the strong social policy it has promised.

It is exceptionally important that this time concern is being shown in a sphere which had been neglected for years on end. A sphere which creates something much more precious than gold reserves—the spiritual and intellectual potential of our development. This means that perestroyka is really not indifferent about its future.

The young people who personify this future assembled yesterday at their all-union students' forum. In what mood did they begin the sitting of the "students' parliament?" Here is what polls conducted by sociologists show. Some 15 percent of delegates want radical solutions capable of putting an end to the old higher education routine. About 38 percent hope that a considered concept will be laid

down, helping to arrive at a solution to the main problems of higher education. Some 21 percent of those polled did not give a clear-cut answer to the question "What do you expect from the forum?" There are 20 percent who believe that even though the forum may formulate interesting solutions, it will be in no position to alter anything on the whole. And 6 percent associate no hopes with the forum.

So much for the division of opinions which, as we can see, shows optimism and skepticism side by side. Never mind, young people are supposed to have their doubts, as long as they lead to a desire to arrive at the truth rather than to sinking in apathy and indifference.

There is an equally interesting expert appraisal, conducted by students, of the activity of various departments and organizations associated to varying degrees with students' lives. The future specialists proved very strict in their allocation of ratings. Neither the USSR State Committee for Public Education, nor the Komsomol Central Committee, nor the AUCCTU managed to gain four points [out of a maximum of five]. And trade union committees at VUZ's where the polls were conducted failed to gain even three points. [passage omitted]

Grossu Replaced as Moldavian Party Head

LD1611120789 Moscow TASS in English 1201 GMT 16 Nov 89

[Text] Kishinev November 16 TASS—Petr Luchinskiy, 49, was elected first secretary of the Central Committee of the Moldavian Communist Party at today's plenary meeting of the party's Central Committee. He has replaced Semen Grossu, who headed the republic's party organisation since 1980. Grossu was relieved of his duties in connection with his transfer to another job.

Petr Lushinskiy, a Moldavian, graduated Kishinev State University and received training at the Higher Party School of the CPSU Central Committee. He is Candidate of Sciences (Philosophy).

Luchinskiy headed the Moldavian Young Communist League at the age of 27. Four years later he was elected secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Moldavia and then became first secretary of the Kishinev Party Committee. Later Luchinskiy worked in the apparatus of the CPSU Central Committee. In recent years he was second secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Tajikistan.

Petr Luchinskiy is member of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee and member of the CPSU Central Committee's Foreign Policy Commission.

Further on Disturbances in Moldavia

Aftermath Reported

PM1511140189 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 14 Nov 89 First Edition p 1

[Dispatch by "Our special correspondent" Captain 3d Rank A. Orlov: "Preserving Restraint and Calm"]

[Text] Kishinev, 13 Nov—On the morning of 12 November in the garden on Victory Square an elderly woman cleaner was sweeping the leaflets and newspapers left from yesterday into a heap. Lenin Street in front of the building of the republic's Ministry of Internal Affairs [MVD] had already been cleared of obstacles—of stones, broken bricks, and bottles. But this part of the street has not yet regained its former well tended look. Something tense remains in it.

But the working day began as usual. Yet the day before several hundred people had gathered at the monument to Stefan the Great. A three-colored flag was hoisted next to the base. It is called the "tricolor" and serves as the banner of the Moldavian People's Front. Debates took place here from the morning to the late evening.

My new acquaintance, a Moldavian, translated in a low voice what I had not managed to work out. The square was filled with rumors. The impression was as though the rumors had come here after being produced in a well organized manner. Rumors that Tbilisi was being repeated in Kishinev, that everything which had taken place was a provocation... the KGB.

It is extremely important to counter these rumors with truthful information about what happened. To this end city and republic officials are speaking on local television. A temporary press center has started to operate under the Moldavian MVD.

I talked with some of the eyewitnesses to the events in the MVD hospital. Incidentally, it has now become known that on 10 November first aid was given at the hospital and in the MVD building to over a total of over 142 wounded internal troops servicemen and militiamen. I recall that over 40 civilians also suffered.

I talked in a hospital ward with Militia Captain A. Peshin. In the past he was an Air Force political worker, relieved of military duty after an injury. He is now an inspector in the Moldavian MVD special militia detachment's analytic group. He was taken from the MVD building with numerous bruises and concussion:

"Even after the 7 November parade, which was broken up, people were heard telling the militia: 'We'll organize a holiday for you!..' And on 10 November... At first several hundred and then thousands of people gathered outside the MVD and shouts and insults flew through the air. People were even on the roof of the building opposite. Several calls to order were made to everyone over loudspeakers but that, alas, merely whipped up emotions. Young men started to pull up paving stones.

Stones, bottles, and cans went flying, including from the roof. The first smoke-puff charge went off. People were wounded. We were still standing and waiting to see what orders would come. Incidentally, we could see that what seemed to be messengers were running from group to group in the crowd. And after that the groups would change positions, continuing to use their "ammunition." Then I realized there were women and children there? Why were they there? But then they rapidly disappeared somewhere. We received the order to clear the street and we advanced. planks, flagstaffs, pipes, and pieces of iron were used against us.

"We used water cannon and 'cheremukha.' The first cobblestone hit me in the thigh. I was given a pain-killing injection at the MVD building and I returned to the street. The second blow caught me in the knee. Then I was struck on the head...."

The republic's prosecutor's office has set about investigating the excesses. I think the justice organs will give their impartial assessment of what happened. And it is not only the prosecutor's office which today needs a calm view of what happened.

"We believe that the reasons for the incident have now been analyzed in the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau resolution which assesses the 7 November events and in the joint appeal of the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee and Moldavian Supreme Soviet Presidium and Council of Ministers to the republic's population," said V. Viyeru, deputy chief of the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee State and Law Department. "Briefly, you cannot play on the people's mood, as has been widely practised in the republic recently by many of those who have assumed the powers of 'expressers of the people's aspirations.' Stoking aggression, the appeal says, is political adventurism. These are provocative, essentially antiperestroyka, actions. The appeal contains a call to all inhabitants of the republic and its capital to display calm and restraint."

The Moldavian Supreme Soviet Presidium and the republic's government have taken extraordinary measures to stabilize the situation, safeguard public order, and protect citizens' safety. In Kishinev the holding of mass demonstrations, rallies, and meetings, and street processions, the sale of liquor in the trade network and at enterprises, and the presence of minors on streets and squares and in parks after 2000 hours are forbidden until special authorization is given.

The events in Kishinev have been commented on differently everywhere. In the five southern rayons of the republic, where the majority of the population is Gagauz, there has been a second congress of the "Gagauz-Khalky" (Gagauz People) informal association. The congress expressed the desire to vote for the Gagauz people's autonomy. The Moldavian International Front has held meetings in Kishinev and a number of other cities at which it has expressed the desire to create public law and order detachments. A meeting has been held between USSR people's deputies and members of the Moldavian People's Front executive committee and the republic's party and soviet workers. The leaders of the Moldavian People's Front tried to dissociate themselves from the atrocities and hooligan attacks: It was the work of extremists with nothing to do with the Moldavian People's Front, the said.

On 12 November the so-called Citizens' Committee was created, joined by the leaders of the Moldavian People's Front. This committee has issued a kind of ultimatum: Unless the republic's present government resigns by Wednesday 15 November a republic-wide strike will begin.

In an interview with republican television and radio S.K. Grossu, first secretary of the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee, assessed the situation which has taken shape. He described in detail the progress in the reforms of the political system and the economy and the solution of problems in the social and spiritual sphere. Stressing the complexity of these problems, S.K. Grossu noted that they are constantly the focus of attention of the republic's leadership and urged the inhabitants of Moldavia to display the utmost responsibility and understanding of the need for constructive work to resolve the urgent problems. Extremist illegal actions are incompatible with that, he emphasized.

First Secretary on Situation

LD1511235489 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 15 Nov 89

[Text] The situation in Kishinev is returning to normal afer the recent disturbances there.

[Correspondent I. Petkov] So, today at Kishinev's industrial enterprises and in the educational establishments, members of the bureau of the party Central Committee and the republican government are being met in the collectives. And there are all kinds of questions. Here, in the polytechnical college, teachers and students are worried by the fact that the disturbances in the city have been foreseen and prevented, and that as far as perestroyka in Moldavia is concerned, at the moment there are a lot of words and no action. And although not all the answers given by comrade Grossu, first secretary of the republican Communist Party Central Committee, satisfied people, they are being permeated with confidence and the belief that time is not yet lost.

[S.K. Grossu, first secretary of the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee] Three programs have been worked out which are now being compared. They are, essentially, now being compared with the union concept, and starting from 1991 we are due to implement them. But, at the same time, I have to say that the questions of integration should not decrease in the future. On the contrary, they should even increase...

[Petkov, interrupting] After all, Moldavia has its own specific conditions...

[Grossu] Especially if you take into consideration the fact that we are now moving over to a sudden development of the technical industries—instrument building, the development of electronics, and so on. Here, it is only with the assistance of many enterprises of union subordination, of the union republics and large cities, that we will be able to proceed with the rapid development of these science-based industries and have a complete workforce.

Already next year's plan provides for over 60 percent of the whole volume of capital investments being channelled into sociocultural construction and into the production of consumer goods, which has never happened before in the past. So, as you can see, the economy is now leaning toward the individual, toward the working people of the republic, and this should, naturally, relieve much of the tension which has now been created in our society. [video shows Grossu and other officials entering a building; shots of meeting, some speakers, including Grossu; interview with Grossu]

Efforts to Improve Situation Fail

LD1511134189 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1120 GMT 15 Nov 89

[Text] Kishinev, 15 Nov (TASS)—Ivan Gutsu, secretary of the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee, a Soviet republic in the southwest of the USSR, speaking at a press conference here late on Tuesday evening [14 November], admitted that the measures to normalize the situation in Moldavia undertaken by the republic's leadership had at times been belated and ineffective. He noted that the disturbances that took place between 7 and 10 November in Kishinev, the Moldavian capital, was a new spiral of the worsening sociopolitical situation in the republic. "Recently, destructive forces have succeeded in carrying out their acts here and there, catching us unaware, and achieving their ends to a certain extent", said Ivan Gutsu. The main aim is to destabilize the situation in the republic and to discredit the Moldavian leadership.

Major General Vladimir Voronin, minister of internal affairs of Moldavia, also replied to journalists' questions. He noted that "whereas the situation in Kishinev has outwardly stabilized and is calm, the overall situation remains very disturbing and unpredictable".

Nikolay Demidenko, procurator of the republic, reported that proceedings had been instituted in two criminal cases. The first is to do with the events of 7 November, in connection with an article of the Moldavian Criminal Code, which covers responsibility for group violations of public order; in this case connected with the disruption of the march past and parade of military hardware. The second is to do with the events of 10 November, in accordance with the article covering responsibility for mass disturbances. Two investigative groups have been set up.

Moldavian Popular Front 29 Oct Meeting Detailed

LD1411213389 Kishinev SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA in Russian 1 Nov 89 p 3

[Text] There was a sanctioned meeting of the Moldavian Popular Front [MPF] in the Green Theater at the Central Culture and Leisure Park on 29 October. Those taking part the discussion of material from the 15th plenum of the Moldavian CP [CP] Central Committee and issues connected with the registration of the MPF and the tasks ahead on the agenda.

Those who spoke welcomed the registration of the Popular Front and stressed that this is a first step, as they put it, toward the demonopolization of party authority and the first stage in transforming the MPF from a spontaneous patriotic movement into an organization with a well thought-out platform. They called for work to establish support groups to be increased.

Those taking part in the meeting opposed the creation of a Gagauz and Prindnestrovskaya ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Republic]. They also opposed giving state language status to Russian. They did not agree with the assessment of the activity of the MPF which was made by the 15th plenum of the Moldavian CP Cental Committee and demanded that the organizers of the strikes which occurred in the republic be named and brought to book.

Several addresses included insulting remarks about the Moldavian CP Cental Committee and several leaders of the republic as well as provocative suggestions that there should be pickets on Victory Square on 7 November to ruin the demonstration there. And although those taking part in the meeting voted for another proposal—to take part in the democration as a separate section—G. Gimpu, a member of the MPF Executive Committee stated that the Executive Committee reserves the right to make the final decision on this issue.

The regulations of the Popular Front state that it "categorically rejects all discrimination and advocation of hatred and violence." But in practice, as we can see, something different is contemplated. In this connection the population of the republic should be aware of the possible consequences of such appeals and actions by the MPF leaders who bear complete responsibility for the unpredictable nature of events.

They constantly resort to extremes, whipping up the already tense sociopolitical situation in the republic. At the meeting there were several cases where speakers and leaders of the MPF openly called for many issues to be resolved using pressure and by issuing ultimatums. Thus, they stated that if the amendments to the election law put forward by the Popular Front are not adopted, then there should be an election boycott and everything

should be done to ensure that the initiative at the elections should be in the hands of the Popular Front. The idea that a referendum law can be adopted only after a law on citizenship is adopted was expressed just as categorically.

Certain participants in the meeting reached their own understanding of a clause adopted in a resolution expressing disagreement with the decision of the town Executive Committee on the inexpediency of holding meetings and marches at Victory Square and the streets and parks adjacent to it, apart, that is, from festive demonstrations and events. They made inflammatory attempts to persuade those at the meeting to go out into the town's central square.

Vorkuta Mining Situation Updated

Five Demands Made

PM1611141789 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 15 Nov 89 Second Edition p 2

[V. Makarov dispatch: "Situation in Pechora Coalfield: Vorkuta Miners' Ultimatum"]

[Text] Vorkuta, Komi ASSR—The Vorkuta miners' strike, which has been going on for many days already, is still not over. The "Zapolyarnaya" Mine is the only one of the 13 local coal mining enterprises that is not taking part in it. Its collective is continuing to work at the usual rate and is mining and dispatching fuel to consumers while adhering to a special stance. It shares and supports the demands of the Arctic miners, but considers it unwise to seek to attain them by this means at the moment, especially on the threshold of winter.

The "Ayach-Yaga" Mine, which is providing fuel solely for the city's heat and power station, is now operating steadily with the consent of the strike committees. And in addition, coal is being mined at the "Vorkutinskaya" and "Komsomolskaya" Mines, also with the strike committees' consent. The point is that the byproduct natural gas is used to fuel the boilers which heat several Vorkuta neighborhoods and nearby settlements. Yesterday these mines resumed deliveries of coal to consumers outside the city limits.

But this fact cannot be seen as the beginning of the end of the strike. The strike continues. The city workers' (strike) committee simply made an emergency decision yesterday morning in view of the prevailing circumstances. Its essence is as follows. Cherepovets' representatives reported that there was a crisis in the city's heating system because of the lack of coal. Therefore the strike committee allowed the "Komsomolskaya" Mine to dispatch fuel to the city.

A delegate was sent from the Vorkuta strikers to Cherepovets to check that this consignment of fuel is used for the specified purpose. And the "Vorkutinskaya" Mine strike committee allowed the striking miners not just to mine coal, but to dispatch it to those who use it. Because there are no coal heaps here and the fuel freezes.

Two groups of Vorkuta miners' representatives have left for Moscow. One has gone to a session of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Court to hear the appeals of the Vorkuta strike committees to repeal the decision of the Komi Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic [ASSR] Supreme Court deeming the strikes in a number of mines in the "Vorkutaugol" Association to be illegal. The other group of miners will take part 17 November in examining the progress made in fulfilling government resolution No 808 in the presence of N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers. It has instructions to obtain fulfillment of a special package of measures in addition to implementation of this resolution. The package contains five points, as a TASS correspondent was told at the Vorkuta city workers' (strike) committee:

To repeal the charter on discipline for workers employed in particularly dangerous underground conditions;

To preserve the wage supplement for work carried out in Extreme Northern regions for workers when they transfer from one enterprise to another. With no restrictions or conditions;

To pay young men and women who have lived 5 years or more in the north the northern wage supplement in full and immediately when they start work and to pay those who have lived there less than 5 years different sums according to the number of years they have lived there;

To officially ratify the status of the workers' (strike) committee as a permanent organ and to give it special powers;

To punish those to blame for the failure to fulfill a number of points of government resolution No 608 within the time limits.

A TASS correspondent put the following question to members of Vorkuta city strike committee: What could make the striking miners return to work? Cocha[illegible]man V. Kopasov answered on behalf of the committee:

"When these five demands are met, we are prepared to suspend the strike. Until that time, the miners intend to carry on striking."

Admittedly, as the USSR Ministry of the Coal Industry announced, on 11 November the government repealed the old disciplinary charter on work in particularly dangerous underground conditions. The Vorkuta miners were told of this.

The damage from the current miners' strike in the Arctic region has reached enormous proportions. Around 435,000 tonnes of fuel less than the target have been mined in the "Vorkutaugol" Association since the beginning of November.

Free Unions Sought

AU1511195989 Paris AFP in English 1933 GMT 15 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow, Nov 15 (AFP)—Coal miners in the northern Soviet town of Vorkuta, who have been on strike for three weeks, Wednesday reaffirmed that they wanted the ending of the Communist Party's leading role in Soviet affairs. A delegation of miners said here that they were demanding the abrogation of article six of the Soviet constitution, which stipulates the leading role of the Communist party in Soviet society. They also wanted the direct election of the Soviet president by universal suffrage, and a ban on the Soviet president also being leader of the Communist party, as is currently the case.

The strikers' initial demand had been the implementation of an agreement reached with the government after a miners' strike last July.

The representatives, who are to meet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov on Friday, added that the strikers had received a message of support from the U.S. trade union group, the American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO). The message, dated Tuesday, said the AFL-CIO "sends strongest support to the miners who are demanding the most elementary right of all workers, the right to form a free trade union", spokesman Nikolay Terekhin said.

The 15,000 strikers at Vorkuta, inside the Arctic circle, have appealed for logistic and financial aid from British and American unions. The AFL-CIO message did not indicate whether any aid had been sent.

The representatives added that it intended to withdraw from the official Soviet trade union federation in order to create an independent union. A representative of the official federation, attending the press conference, said the issue of free unions was to be discussed at the federation congress next March.

Strike Affecting Smelting

LD1611102389 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 15 Nov 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] A TASS correspondent reports from Lipetsk.

The coke oven batteries at Lipetsk Magnitka have been switched to slow speed. The move has been an enforced one. The blast furnace workers believe that violation of the schedule for supplying starting materials could cause profound disruption in the pig-iron smelting furnaces. Following that in the "technological chain" would be the converters and later the rolling mills. The labor conflict at the Vorkuta mines threatens a breakdown in the whole metal production system. Since the beginning of the month, because of the strike, the Novolipetsk Metallurgical Combine has received 28,000 tonnes of coking coal less than is due. Winter lies ahead, but the metallurgists so far have only a half of the normal supplies of coal.

Situation at Working Mine

PM1511155389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Nov 89 Second Edition p 6

[PRAVDA correspondent G. Sazonov "Reportage From Vorkuta": "Position"]

[Text] Vorkuta, 13 Nov—The situation in Vorkuta is changing not daily but hourly. I contact the "Vorkutaugol" Association in the mornings in order to keep abreast of things. The dispatcher's reports vary but one thing remains unchanged—the "Zapolyarnaya" Mine is operating. What kind of phenomenon is that? Not a single production sector has been shut down there. Its output—high-quality coking coal—is being smoothly dispatched to Cherepovets. Some strikers regard the enterprise as "going its own way." Others, on the contrary, see the collective's behavior as noble. Still others assure us that the administration is allegedly issuing everyone with an envelope containing R100 for going underground. What is the real situation?

I drove through the snow-covered tundra in the hazy twilight of the approaching polar night—the mine is 40 km or so from the city. Red letters —"Zapolyarnaya" Mine—gleam in the distance. Recently people here could scarcely make ends meet. But things changed for the better with the arrival of Director A. Prasolov, who was, incidentally, elected democratically from multiple candidates. Workers' wages rose. The collective trusts the leader and vice versa. This mutual trust and mutual responsibility were clearly also the reason for the mine being a rarity in the strike situation.

"I spent all night on strike today," the director admitted with a melancholy smile. "Fortunately, I only dreamed it. That is how far my head is buzzing with rallies and disputes. But the envelopes containing hundreds of rubles are a flight of fantasy."

The mine collective fulfilled the yearly plan 2 November—it has extracted 1,100,000 tonnes of coal. It now has approximately 200,000 tonnes of additional output and will, according to preliminary data, obtain more than R2.5 million in profit. But here is the problem. The collective is still not entitled to dispose of this profit or of its above-plan output. In other words, the enterprise's level of autonomy is zero. Admittedly, 1 month ago the miners were authorized to sell a small proportion of the above-plan coal abroad but, alas, they have no licenses. Miners are also striking against this situation whereby they are deprived of rights.

"No, I personally, along with other leaders and other workers, am not opposed to the strike," Afanasiy Vasilyevich Prasolov said. "The July strike raised miners' consciousness. As a leader I am more confident—I am bolder in putting questions to the association. But when strikes began in October, our activists and I said to the miners: Let us act lawfully. Otherwise who are we opposing, bearing in mind that winter is drawing near?

Our own brother workers—railroad workers, metallurgists, machine builders, and people...."

Emotions were also in ferment at "Zapolyarnaya." In the first few days of November 27 miners gathered in the mine's assembly hall and called for a strike. But the next morning activists held an alternative rally there, inviting members of the party committee, the strike committee, the trade union committee, and other organizations to it. The heated speeches were relayed to production areas. This clear stance—nothing could be hidden—also helped control the situation. By a majority vote it was decided to reject a strike and familiarize the primary collectives with the decision—let people themselves decide what to do. The miners favored working. At the same time they supported many of the strikers' demands, particularly the demands for mine autonomy.

In short, people at "Zapolyarnaya" found their own approach to a complex situation: They decided not to deviate from demands and to strive to fully implement the government resolution adopted in the light of miners' main aspirations, but not to stop work in the pits.

Afanasiy Vasilyevich Prasolov worked 28 years underground, 20 years as an engineer. He led the "Tsentralnaya" Mine and turned it from a laggard into a front-ranker. He knows a miner's life "inside out." What, in his opinion, are the reasons for the strike?

"There are two sets of reasons," he replied. "First, the city's party aktiv remained on the sidelines of events. Including the leaders of production sectors at the mines. Many of them are afraid that there will be a vote of no-confidence in them because there are hotheads in the strike committees and they don't mince their words. In addition, in my view, irresponsible individuals have joined the strike movement."

Prasolov has addressed other mine collectives, and each time he has been asked whether he has received an answer to his cable to the government. Unfortunately, the people at "Zapolyarnaya" have not received any answer. This element is the most vulnerable point in the agitation carried out by the director of the only operational mine in favor of ending the strike.

Nonetheless, there has been some "thaw" here. Late Saturday evening three important government announcements came from Moscow to Vorkuta. The Ministry of the Coal Industry's "disciplinary regulation" has finally been rescinded. The question of northern wage supplements has been solved positively. Mindful of the situation that has taken shape in the region, the USSR Council of Ministers has adopted a resolution to temporarily suspend the law on the election of leaders of mines and subunits within the "Vorkutaugol" Association. I would like to believe that these steps will help the constructive dialogue at the government scheduled for next Friday. In the meantime there has again been depressing news since Monday morning: Only the "Zapolyarnaya" Mine is working normally.

Further on Situation

LD1511220889 Moscow TASS in English 2143 GMT 15 Nov 89

[Text] Vorkuta November 16 TASS—Four out of thirteen Vorkuta mines were mining coal and shipping it to consumers Wednesday. The "Ayach-Yaga" mine ships fuel only to the thermal power station of the city. The rest of the mines of the "Vorkutaugol" association continue on strike.

Losses occasioned by the strike are mounting. From the beginning of November the customers received 574,000 tonnes of coal less than they had hoped for.

Another cable has come from the workers of the Cherepovetskiy steel plant. They write about the difficulties they had to face restoring their coking furnaces to normalcy after the miners' summer strike and about the present plight of the steel plant.

They are urging the strikers to resume work and warn that their own enterprise is about to stop.

Many letters and cables comes in these days to party and Soviet bodies and the editorial boards of the newspapers of the Komi autonomous Republic.

Most writers disapprove of the strikes. They are alarmed by the consequences of the stoppages. There is a growing threat of boilers running out of fuel in villages and settlements in the south of the Komi Republic.

It is an arduous road to the dialogue. Although there have been some positive changes in the mood of the striking workers, an increasing number of miners are beginning to be guided by reason, not emotions, and advocate a "worthy way out of the strike". The coordinating committee of the members of the party committees of the mines, of the mechanical plant and of the department for assembly and testing of equipment of "vorkutaugol" association are becoming increasingly active. It is doing the work of explaining and controlling the progress in implementing government decision 608 and informing the Vorkuta residents.

On Tuesday the Supreme Court of the Russian Federation examined a complaint from Vorkuta strike committees who want the repeal of the decision by the Komi Supreme Court decision was left unchanged.

Work Collectives Discuss Kuzbass

LD1611024689 Moscow TASS in English 2020 GMT 15 Nov 89

[Text] Kemerovo November 15 TASS—The first conference of work collectives of the Kemerovo Region concluded here today.

It was organised by the regional council of trade unions on the initiative of workers of a number of enterprises and the bureau of the regional communist party committee.

Participants representing all industries of the territory discussed ways to upgrade work and responsibility of work collectives for the fulfillment of social and economic programmes and the strengthening of their influence on the social and political life in the region.

Delegates arrived at the conclusion that radical economic reform has been too slow in Kuzbass and the decisive step towards introducing economic methods of management has not yet been fully taken. Hence the imbalances on the market, spiralling prices, departmental arbitrariness, neglect of the social sphere and low discipline.

Much effort is needed to counter these negative processes, it was stressed at the conference. The delegates agreed that the effort is to be made by workers themselves. Not somebody else. Proceeding from this conclusion they identified the principal directions of work collective activity for the next few months in the economic, political, social and environmental spheres.

Commenting on the results of the conference, first Secretary of the Kemerovo Regional Party Committee Aleksandr Melnikov said that "the workers" movement and perestroika are the greatest achievements of the past four years.

"Behind all this is the immense political work of the Communist Party and it is impossible to overlook the fact. The party organisations are supporting the workers' movement. No one can divorce the Communist Party, the working class, and the people".

Melnikov noted that in the present situation, the role of work collectives and their councils as the chief legitimate bodies and guardians of true democracy is notably growing in importance.

"The growing political awareness of the people was in the centre of attention of the conference. The bureau of the regional Communist Party Committee supports the decisions adopted by the conference and will make them binding on all communists".

Miners' Conference Held in Kuznetsk Basin

LD1611112789 Moscow TASS in English 1107 GMT 16 Nov 89

[Text] Kemerovo November 16 TASS—By TASS correspondent Grigoriy Shalakin:

"It is long past the time to understand that no emergency measures or laws will bring us order or prosperity. We can achieve this only with our own work and not with ultimatums. We should not dissipate our forces but pool the efforts of work collectives." Such statements prevailed at a conference of work collectives, which ended on Wednesday [15 November] in Kemerovo, the centre of the Kuznetsk coal basin (southern Siberia).

Coal miners discussed difficulties in the economic and social life of the region and outlined activities for work collectives in the economic, political, ecological and social spheres.

The conference noted that in the basin radical economic reform is dragging its feet, and that no resolute moves have been made to turn to economic methods of administration. The conference called on work collectives not to wait for instructions from above and to become owners, responsible for their mines, factories, construction projects and farms.

The conference sent a telegram to Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov, expressing concern over slow progress in fulfilling the protocol signed between a government commission and striking miners last July.

The telegram contains a request to send a government commission to the basin. It also requests to take measures on a political and economic settlement of the labour dispute in Vorkuta where miners of the Pechora coal basin continue to strike.

'Alternative' 7 November Parade Noted

90UN0267A Moscow MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 8 Nov 89 p 2

[TASS report by I. Tabakova: "Procession Through Sadovoy Ring"]

[Text] Simultaneously with the festive demonstration of workers of the capital in Red Square, the Moscow voters' association, the Russian People's Front, and other independent social associations organized on 7 November a sanctioned alternative parade around Sadovoy Ring. Individual participants attempted to change the agreed-upon route for the procession but the majority did not support them. Participants in the procession held a rally at the Olympics complex on Peace Prospekt.

Unsanctioned 7 November Meeting Reported

90UN0267B Moscow MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 8 Nov 89 p 2

[Report by I. Tabakova]

[Text] Yesterday an unsanctioned rally was held on Pushkin Square by the "young democrats" group. This what the young people, who had raised bourgeois flags, called themselves. The slogans they were shouting were clearly provocatory. Apparently their main goal was to "suffer" from the nightsticks of the special militia detachment. This did not happen.

Fall Draft Sparks Latvian Anti-Army Campaign

PM3110163389 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 31 Oct 89 First Edition p 1

[Correspondent Lieutenant Colonel M. Ziyeminsh article: "Refuseniks, or How 'Demilitarization' of Latvia Looks in Practice"]

[Text] Riga—The newspaper report was concise: "Yurmala People's Court has examined the case of Kharald Shteynberg, who from political beliefs refused to do 25 days army training. The accused felt it impossible to serve in an army which has on its conscience the 'occupation of Latvia and its subsequent annexation in 1940, the events in Hungary in 1956, the ruthless suppression of the "Prague Spring" in 1968, Afghanistan'...." Subsequently, it was reported that Shteynberg's defense which cited international documents, was conducted by a lawyer who is also an activist of the movement for Latvian national independence "but that the outmoded law prevented the court from granting an acquittal." The court found Kh. Shteynberg guilty under Section 1 of Article 194 of the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Criminal Code and fined him R150. This was the first time, the findings stated, that the Yurmala People's Court had examined the case of a man who had refused to serve in the Soviet Army from political beliefs.

It may now be said with virtually no fear of contradiction that this month-old report which, incidentally, certain mass media organizations specializing in the Baltic also noticed, has become a kind of departure point for what is by all accounts yet another well coordinated campaign against the Armed Forces. As with any well organized event, this new campaign was preceded by a quite substantial preparatory stage or, more precisely, one based on rallies. Some speakers at street meetings and well organized indoor meetings as well as comments in various statements, declarations, and written addresses seem to have methodically introduced into the context of the general changes related to the radical restructuring of the national economic mechanism the idea that the problem of the performance of military service by young Balts recently has become increasingly acute. For the most part, they perform their service far from home in an alien and sometimes hostile environment and as a consequence "people are murdered, commit suicide, are humiliated or maimed, and the rate of desertion and refusal to serve has increased."

Of course, not every speaker or writer expressed himself in those very words. Each one spoke or wrote in his own style and manner; but the "general strategy" should be correctly defined and properly understood, and each individual will find his own cause for action depending on the level of his political culture. And, of course, that is what happened. Their actions sometimes were loud, couched in the form of disrespectful ultimatums, tendentious, and embroiled in the active search for any errors made by people in army uniform. For example, questions about the disappearance of servicemen were repeatedly put to the commander of the Baltic Military District who knew nothing about them. There were also categorical statements that "bullying" is being encouraged and inculcated by the command.

Under the direction of a single group, the affair has been brought to the stage where "this year's fall draft may cause a wave of opposition among women's and other social organizations in the Baltic and give rise to increasing civil disobedience among young people." In Lithuania and Estonia, too, it is said, such incidents are by no means rare. The implication is: "Why are we in Latvia trailing behind those two republics yet again?" We are lagging behind on all counts. Let's put the pressure on. Otherwise, you'll see, some people will try to use us as a wedge to split the Baltic peoples. Can such a disgrace really be tolerated? After all, there are "examples worthy of imitation." Take, for example, Junior Sergeants Yu. Rubens and K. Luts (a Latvian and an Estonian) who have already run away from their unit three times. Twice they believed the promises of their commanders that nothing would happen to them for their actions so they returned. Now they no longer believe them and are in hiding. From a legal standpoint perhaps, a newspaper explained, the actions of the lads and their parents were shortsighted, but one must make allowances. For greater plausibility as well as "moral support" for those lads and their parents that same newspaper reported (the newspaper in question is ATMODA), for example, that in the city of Valmiyer a Latvian pacifist movement has been created which is calling on all those worried by questions related to military service in the USSR Armed Forces to join it. It reported that 747 inhabitants of the settlement of Roya signed a letter supporting the idea of creating territorial forces and that in a Riga secondary school there has been a Latvian People's Front youth conference where the main question was the demilitarization of schools and where the agenda included the demand to replace military studies by physical training....

Nevertheless, this is just the tip of the vast propaganda iceberg of a number of informal associations which, by working on the little by little principle, are still hoping to achieve their quite definite individual and group aims. At the republic's military registration and enlistment office, I was shown examples of collective letters where under a single banner headline the parents of draftees present almost as an ultimatum their demand that their sons perform their military service either solely on Latvian territory or exceptionally on the territory of the Baltic Military District. Dozens of letters like that are sent to local and central organs.

This question is not as easy as it may seem at first glance. To "legitimize" such a demand is tantamount to creating certain privileges for a section of draftees even though our Armed Forces are formed on an international basis and all citizens, irrespective of nationality, must serve in accordance with all-union laws. There is another equally important factor: Many young people, if not the majority of them, do not want to solve the problem of their military service in this way. On the contrary, they are dying, so to speak, to go to other parts of the country as well as to those forces stationed abroad because they want to broaden their horizons, which is perfectly natural for any young person.

At the same time, it must be said that the Ministry of Defense recently has considered a number of parents' requests. It has taken the real opportunities into account

and is sending around 20 percent of draftees from Latvia to forces in the Baltic Military District, and this spring, for example, 80 percent of draftees from Latvia began their military service in the European part of the country.

Here is how USSR People's Deputy Colonel General F. Kuzmin, commander of the Baltic Military District, commented on this year's fall draft.

"In the model that is being prepared for the draft this fall," he said in reply to numerous letters from voters on this theme, "it is planned, despite the difficulties, to place up to 30 percent of the recruits from the Latvian SSR in the district's own forces. To reach this figure, the General Staff and the staff of the district have had to revise the internal links in the system for training almost 1,500 military specialists...."

Nevertheless, some people clearly dislike such a solution of the question and, it seems, will continue to dislike it in the future, too. They dislike the rational and strict observance of present and future laws governing service in the Armed Forces. For example, what is the informal youth association's appeal "Fatherland and Freedom" addressed to Latvian draftees, an appeal now circulating in the republic, trying to encourage inexperienced youngsters to do? To openly violate the law, that is, to commit a crime. "On 17 June," it says among other things, "the Armed Forces of the Soviet Union invaded the territory of independent Latvia and have occupied it to this day. Throughout these years of occupation, Soviet power has recruited young Latvians aged 18 for active military service." That, it is argued, "is in contravention of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the norms of the international rights of man" and young people's answer to that should be a "categorical boycott of active military service."

The Latvian Republic Council of War, Labor, and Armed Forces Veterans viewed that appeal as blatant provocation and incitement to mass unconstitutional actions. It rightly saw in this grounds for calling the authors to account before the law.

It must be said that some leaders of informal associations find the "theme of occupation and its legality" particularly conducive to the concealment of their unlawful and irresponsible appeals. But what do the republic's acknowledged authorities think about this?

"Allow me to recall here," USSR People's Deputy Yu. Voyars, a doctor of legal sciences and activist of the Latvian People's Front, said, "that the most conventional 'regime of occupation' means a general military administration and tanks on the streets. (This is the comment of a specialist in international law—M.Z. note) A normal regime of occupation precludes all forms of parliamentary activity and one's own legislation. Elections, opposition political parties, and in any event the activity of those groupings which harms the occupation powers and to which our heroes belong...."

At the time that I was writing these lines, five pickets under the "direction" of a middle-aged sickly looking man named Rubens were standing shivering in front of the military registration and enlistment office in Latvia's Kuldigskiy Rayon. The inscriptions on their placards look and—most important—sound most imposing. Here is one of them: "Boys, better to go to jail than to serve in the army of occupation." Or take this one: "By serving in the Armed Forces of the Soviet empire you risk becoming the murderer of the children and women of other peoples." Pride of place, however, went to this placard: "We demand an end to the fall draft."

The familiar fall draft goes on anyway, including in Kuldigskiy Rayon, 90 percent of whose population are Latvians, and without any violations of public order to date.

"In the first few days," Lieutenant Colonel Uldis Naburgs, the rayon's military commissar, told me, "there was an unprecedented influx of representatives of various informal organizations and the mass media, everyone was waiting for something to happen and then for some reason lost interest in the work of the draft commission...."

You can guess what they were waiting for and why they lost interest.

When the report had been prepared for publication, I phoned Major General Ya. Duda, the republic's military commissar:

"How many 'refuseniks' have there been so far?"

"Seven. I can give you their names...."

"How do you deal with them?"

"The files have been passed on to the prosecutor's office...."

The normal operation of the law is possible only if people's development is at a certain level. Aristotle said that, unless I am mistaken.

Latvian Procuracy Appeals for Call-up Observation

LD0711145889 Riga CIMA in Latvian 27 Oct 89 p1

[Text] Announcement by the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic Procuracy: In accordance with the USSR Law "On General Compulsory Military Service" the fall call-up for active military service has begun.

At the present time, when the process of democratization in the republic is expanding, state and party workers, and various public organizations and movements are putting forward proposals for a reorganization of the USSR Armed Forces; the introduction of alternative service; an improvement in discipline in the army; and directing their [state and party workers] action towards perfecting the laws in the parliamentary way. Representatives of

the Riga branch of the Tevzemei un brivibai [For Fatherland and Liberty] young people's association, on the contrary, have irresponsibly begun activities directed at disrupting the fall call-up. In an announcement carried in the ATMODA publication of the LTF, [Latvijas Tautas Fronte; the People's Front of Latvia], the men to be called up are being asked to boycott active military service. At the same time instructions are being given on how to evade military service.

The functionaries of this association, endeavoring by any means to achieve their political ambitions, are playing with the destinies of the young men of Latvia, appealing to them to transgress the law—which envisages criminal responsibility for evading regular call- up into active military service. These friends of the young men are not interested in what consequences will fall on the boys through transgression of the law and the imposition of criminal punishment.

In connection with that, the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic Procuracy announces that the laws in force must be observed by every citizen of the state. Evasion of military service is a crime, and committing this offense cannot but bring the consequences laid down in the law.

With deep concern the Procuracy thinks about those men to be called up who have believed in these irresponsible appeals. We rely upon the reason of parents, and we hope that they will help their sons to refrain from a fateful inconsiderate step. Latvian society and the republic's Procuracy will be satisfied if no man to be called up will have to be called to answer criminal charges for evading service in the army.

At the same time the Procuracy stands on its principles and announces that in the action of the irresponsible instigators and distributors of such announcements there are indications of a crime, because such activity is directed toward destabilizing the situation in the republic, undermining the activity of the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic military commissariat, and ruining the men to be called up.
[Signed] The Latvian Socialist Republic Procuracy.

Lithuanian Communist Party Bureau Summoned

LD1611052189 Vilnius in English to North America 2300 GMT 15 Nov 89

[Text] Today news has been confirmed that the Central Committee Bureau of the Lithuanian Communist Party is summoned to Moscow for a Politburo sitting to be held tomorrow. In an interview granted to the Lithuanian Radio, Vladimir Berezov, second secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party said the Bureau is determined to take a firm stand.

The Politburo sitting itself and its resolution will amount to the first reaction of Moscow to the drive of the Lithuanian Communist Party to become a party with its independent program and statute. There is no doubt that the Lithuanian side will demand an explanation for blocking our aspirations to economic self-dependence. This issue, though at one time given priority by Mikhail Gorbachev himself, is not on the agenda of the second session of the Soviet parliament.

Meanwhile a considerable part of the people's deputies from Lithuania, urged by telegrams from the electorate, did not turn up today for an afternoon sitting. In the morning both chambers separately discussed the bill on Soviet citizenship and the new bill on the languages of the USSR peoples. The Baltic deputies subjected the bills to severe criticism, including the deputy from Klaipeda, (Zina) Shdlichite. The Lithuanian as well as other Baltic deputies believe the bills are still unstudied and therefore unacceptable for us in principle.

Media Coverage of Vilnius Parade Incident Noted

LD1011023989 Vilnius in English to North America 2300 GMT 9 Nov 89

[Text] Notwithstanding the great number of new periodicals that have emerged in Lithuania this year, the official Lithuanian newspapers have preserved, and even increased, their readership. The youth daily KOMJAUNIMO TIESA is still the most popular Lithuanian newspaper with 508,000 subscribers. The daily for country people VALSTIECIU LAIKRASTIS is second in popularity, with a readership of 350,000, though this is 3 percent less than last year.

The organ of the Communist Party's Central Committee, the monthly magazine KOMUNISTAS has turned out to be the worst loser, having preserved only one-third of its readership. This is sheer bankruptcy indeed.

The biggest periodicals of the Lithuanian reform movement Sajudis, the weekly ATGIMIMAS and the RESPUBLIKA newspaper, have won an equal number of subscribers, about 70,000 each.

Next year less central press organs will reach Lithuanian readers. Subscription to the LITERATURNAYA GAZETA has dropped by half in Lithuania. That of PRAVDA and IZVESTIYA dailies by 40 and 20 percent respectively.

Owing to the efforts of Mikhail Gorbachev, the popularity of the weekly ARGUMENTY I FAKTY has been boosted ever more, and in Lithuania, too, subscription has gone up by as much as 58 percent.

Well and reverting to the KOMJAUNIMO TIESA, it should be pointed out that this is the only paper up to now to have printed a photo of the incident during the military parade in Vilnius. As we informed you the day before, a group of people tried to block the way when the column of military vehicles drove out into Gediminas Avenue. Other sources supplemented the Radio Vilnius report, pointing out that those young people had represented not only the Lithuanian Liberty League but also the Geneva 49 Committee and the Democrats' Party.

A participant in the action, however, phoned one of the Radio Vilnius staff and said that those had been just students and not representatives of any political groups.

The law enforcement bodies will most probably investigate the incident and make public the conclusions.

Belorussian Public Bodies Lose Voting Privilege

PM3110114589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 3

[Own correspondent N. Matukovskiy report under "Sessions of the Union Republics' Supreme Soviets" rubric: "Belorussian SSR"]

[Text] Two extremely important questions were put forward for discussion at the 12th session of the republic's Supreme Soviet: the question of the state program to eliminate the aftermath of the accident at the Chernobyl nuclear electric power station; and the question of amendments and additions regulating elections of people's deputies.

The first question already has a "history": At the previous session deputies unanimously rejected the government's proposed program, which was in the nature of an indeterminate "recommendation." That is why speaker V. Yevtukh, first deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers, spoke mainly about amendments and additions to the program on which the government, the State Planning Committee, ministries and departments, and scientists have been working for a long time. The program has become more concrete and businesslike. Almost R17 billion from the union budget will be spent on implementing it.

Hundreds of population centers in Gomel and Mogilev Oblasts, where people may have received a total radiation dose from all radionuclides (cesium, strontium, and plutonium) of up to 35 rems, will have been resettled in 2 years.

Deputies adopted the program with amendments and comments. But this tragic story still has to be concluded. By no means all the questions have been resolved.

As expected, the report by N. Dementey, chairman of the Belorussian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet Presidium, about amendments to the election law provoked the most trenchant debate among deputies. Everything went quite calmly until Deputies V. Kovalenok and G. Yeremeyev and USSR People's Deputy S. Shushkevich spoke. Their arguments were logical and extremely convincing. Why should public organizations—as envisaged in the drafts—"hide" from the people behind departmental screens and nominate "their" deputies by themselves and vote for them within a narrow group of people? Why should these candidates have the edge over others? Why should okrug meetings decide for tens of thousands of voters which candidate may be "allowed" on the secret ballot paper and which may not? Because the elections are not direct in that case.

Common sense won the day. It was decided that henceforth only two organizations in the republic—the Union of War and Labor Veterans and the Invalids' Society—should receive the right to nominate candidates and vote directly. All other organizations come to elections on equal terms with all voters.

The session ratified Belorussian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium decrees. There were two details at the session that must be mentioned. Deputies voted using an electronic system for the first time, and so the process of voting on any question took a matter of seconds. For the first time Lenin Square in front of government house, where the session took place, was guarded by reinforced militia detachments and special subunits with nightsticks: It had become known that "informals" from the Belorussian People's Front in Support of Perestroyka" wanted to meet with deputies. You cannot describe this as dialogue. "Is my militia protecting me?" Yet the informals are also voters....

Ye. Sokolov, first secretary of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee, took part in the session's work.

The session has ended its work.

Belorussian Grodno Obkom Elects First Secretary

LD1611072689 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 15 Nov 89

[From "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] A plenum of the Grodno Obkom of the Belorussian Communist Party was held today, examining an organizational question. The plenum released Comrade Kletskov from his duties as first secretary of the obkom in connection with his retirement on pension.

Comrade Semenov, who worked as party obkom secretary, has been elected first secretary of the Grodno Obkom of the Belorussian Communist Party.

Comrade Sokolov, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Belorussian Communist Party, took part in the plenum's work.

Kazakh Supreme Soviet Opposes Semipalatinsk Tests

LD1511192189 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 15 Nov 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast; video report by correspondents D.Baimbetov and I.Dvorkin]

[Text] For the first time the issue of the nucelar testing ground in Semipalatinsk was submitted for discussion by the deputies of the supreme body of state power in the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR].

[Baimbetov] No to nuclear tests on Kazakhstan's soil. The voice of the public is sounding in unison with the voice of the Kazakhstan Communist Party Central Committee and the Republic's Council of Ministers who back at the beginning of the current year asked the CPSU Central Committee Politburo to examine the problems connected with the Semipalatinsk testing ground which have become extremely exacerbated. After a careful study, the commission, like many that were working before it, came to the conclusion that the tests must be stopped. However, the explosions are still continuing.

[Dvorkin] Once again the Kazakhs are expresing their alarm which has become even more desperate, this time at the sesison of the republic's Supreme Soviet. The deputies cited colossal figures on the scale of the disaster in the test area. They spoke about the economic, social and moral consequences of the 40-year functioning of the testing ground. [video shows scenes at the Supreme Soviet session]

[Begin recording] [A.K.Safonov, USSR people's deputy] Everyone is talking and writing about it it, but so far there have been no changes. This may suit a certain group of people who are involved in this research. Incidentally one should examine the expediency of these tests. What are they contributing to the national economy as a whole, let us say even defense? Is it that a certain sinecure has been created for a certain circle of people in certain organizations to which state budget funds are allocated. They spend the money with pleasure.

[Kh.M. Matveyev, first secretary of the Abayevskiy rayon party committee, Semipalatinsk Oblast] When commissions from the USSR Ministry of Health visited us, they determined, that even superficially and with a bias toward military departments, all types of illnesses are raging among us, quite apart from the impact on the environment. [video shows these two interviews] [End recording]

[Dvorkin] The session stressed the need to work out a comprehensvie program of assistance to the population of the region. the session unanimously adopted an appeal from the Kazakh SSR Supreme Soviet to the USSR Government and to the USSR people's deputies for an end to the nuclear tests at the Semipalatinsk testing ground. [video shows more pictures of Supreme Soviet session]

Kazakh Supreme Soviet Elects New Officials

LD1511133089 Alma Ata Domestic Service in Kazakh 1500 GMT 14 Nov 89

[Text] The Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet has appointed Sergey Aleksandrovich Tereshchenko as first deputy chairman of the Kazakh SSR Council of Ministers.

The Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet has also appointed Balkash Moldabay-ogly Tursunbayev as chairman of the Kazakh SSR State Agroindustrial Committee.

Activists Comment on Armenian Movement's Goals

NC1311095989 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1630 GMT 12 Nov 89

[From the republican press review]

[Text] The youth paper AVANGARD has published a report about the mass meeting held in Freedom Square soon after the constituent conference of the Armenian National Movement closed.

Panos Siradeghyan, a member of the Administration Council of the Armenian National Movement, said in his address that one should not hasten to assess something which is taking place for the first time in 70 years. It was very difficult to organize a conference after conducting a vigorous movement for 2 years. The objective of the conference was not to declare unity; no one needs artificial unity. Our primary concern was the problem of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO]. We do not need disputes, but we do need a strong organization which could lead us to our objective, to real unity.

Susanna Grigoryan, another participant in the mass meeting, told reporters that the conference made no decisions concerning the most basic problems facing the Armenian people. What is more disturbing, she added, is that one of the Karabakh Committee leaders expressed his support for the thesis that the NKAO problem in no way relates to Armenia and that it is merely a problem of self-determination for the Armenians of the NKAO.

Supreme Soviet Official Visits Stepanakert

NC1311092489 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1630 GMT 12 Nov 89

[From the republican press review]

[Text] Tarazevich, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Commission on Nationalities Policy and Interethnic Relations, has visited Stepanakert. He met the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast's [NKAO] party and economic aktiv on 10 November and briefed those present on the preliminary proposals of the commission concerning a political settlement of the problem in the oblast.

The NKAO representatives at the meeting disagreed with many of the commission's conclusions. They expressed the unanimous view that the only way to improve the situation in the region is to satisfy the desires of the overwhelming majority of the NKAO's population. Only a just political solution can extricate the oblast from its critical situation.

This view was also propounded during a rally held on the same day with the participation of thousands of the city's workers. The speakers at the rally stressed that the Artsakh [NKAO] people do not have and cannot have a line of retreat. As the last 2 years and the policy pursued by the Azerbaijan leadership toward the NKAO have revealed, all types of cosmetic measures are condemned to failure. The future of the Armenian population of the NKAO can only be ensured through changing the administrative subordination of the oblast.

Lack of Fuel Cripples Air Transport in Armenia

NC1511142289 Yerevan ARMENPRES International Service in Armenian 1215 GMT 14 Nov 89

[ARMENPRES correspondent S. Babachanyan report: "Airplanes Could Not Take Off"]

[Text] Yerevan, 14 Nov (ARMENPRES)—Air transportation in the republic came to an standstill at 1400 on 10 November. The rumble of machinery ceased at the "Zvartnots" and "Erebuni" Airports of Yerevan and at the central airports of Leninakan. Thousands of passengers could not travel to their destinations and a large amount of freight was grounded. Seventeen flights by union and other airlines could not take off that afternoon and evening. The reason for all of this was a lack of fuel. Fuel stocks were not replenished regularly and were completely exhausted on 10 November. That day, the last 50 tonnes of airplane kerosene was used, in contrast with 300 tonnes normally used daily.

Hamlet Mkrtchyan, acting head of the planning and flights officer at the Armenian Department of the Civil Aviation, told the ARMENPRES correspondent: We should be receiving three-fourths of our total fuel needs from Baku. However, for the last few days, no airplane fuel has arrived in Armenia from Baku. Additionally, 37 tanker cars of fuel from other regions of the country have disappeared along various rail routes. Thus we have been deprived of our ability to operate. A critical situation has developed. Our department has raised, more than once, the alarm with the USSR Civil Aviation Ministry. However, no hopeful reply has been received yet. It is not clear for how long the aviation blockade of Armenian will be maintained by the neighboring republic, or how long the culprits will go unpunished for their sinister work.

The fuel supplies were cut at the very moment when the assistance sent from Armenia, mostly by air, to the blockaded Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] and to the other Armenian inhabited regions in Azerbaijan is more than ever needed. Currently, thousands of tonnes of foodstuffs earmarked for our compatriots have been stored and inventoried at the airports of Yerevan, Kamo, Vartenis, and Goris. Airplanes and helicopters make a few dozen flights daily, transporting passengers as well as flour, sugar, butter, and soap. If the situation does not change, within a few days these flights too will stop and the small amount of fuel set aside for them will be used up without serving any purpose. The blockade of the air route, currently the only means of communication, is being imposed with the intent to break the will of the Armenian people. This is also immensely harmful to the restoration work in the disaster zone. Many building collectives involved in restoration work receive construction materials by air. These flights too could be curtailed because they cannot be refueled at their landing sites. As with the previous blockade, this one too has caused great economic and moral damage..

Armenians Killed Trying to Blow Up Monument

PM1411124389 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 11 Nov 89 p 1

["Own Information" report: "Explosion at Dawn"]

[Text] An explosion resounded at dawn, at approximately 0700 hours. This was evidently earlier than planned and that is why it did not damage the Monument to the Friendship Between the Peoples of Azerbaijan, Armenia, and Georgia on the border between Kazakhskiy Rayon, Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR], and Idzhevanskiy Rayon, Armenian SSR. The criminals who attempted to blow up the monument themselves suffered.

Our correspondents were told by the Azerbaijan KGB that two of them—Ashot Melikbekyan and Father Stepan (Stepan Davtyan in the lay world), a senior priest at the Marakaravan Monastery, died on the spot. Two others—Vasrushan Badalyan, a resident of Idzhevan, and Andrey Kozlitin, who was discharged from the Army into the reserve 1 week before—were wounded. Armenian SSR State Automobile Inspection staffers took the wounded to the Idzhevan Hospital. A scrap of a Bickford fuse, three hunting rifles, and cartridges were found at the scene. And a "Moskvich" belonging to the monastery was found 1 km away from the explosion. The Kazakhskiy Rayon Prosecutor's Office has instituted criminal proceedings. An investigation is under way.

Shokhrat Nagdaliyev, first secretary of Kazakhskiy Lenin Communist Youth League [Komsomol] Rayon Committee, said the situation in Kazakh is calm.

The same morning at 0445 bursts of submachinegun fire rang out in another of Azerbaijan's border rayons—Lachinskiy Rayon. A Karaganda Militia School detail was under fire. Submachinegun bursts broke the silence several times throughout the day. In the evening the automobile in which the detail was traveling was blown up by an explosive device. The driver and the chief of the local branch of the communications junction, who were in the vehicle along with the students, were wounded and were taken to hospital. Another explosive device was found near the scene of the incident.

Here are other facts from the incident reports. On the night of 6 November A. Ambartsumyan, a resident of the village of Khramort in Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO], was wounded in the head when

strangers shot him with a hunting rifle and was hospitalized. The same day residents of Khubiarlu Village in Azerbaijan's Dzhebrailskiy Rayon beat up M. Asryan and stole 50 livestock from him which belonged to residents of the Armenian village of Binyatlu in NKAO's Gadrutskiy Rayon.

Of late a fragile lull had been established on the border between the two republics. Contacts had begun to emerge between the border rayons of Azerbaijan and Armenia and people had again begun to have a glimmer of hope of an end to the confrontation... And suddenly there are submachinegun bursts and explosions in various rayons. Is this chance? I think not. The explosions are directed against this hope. Moreover, in the near future it is planned to discuss the situation in the region at a USSR Supreme Soviet session. Some people are not averse to heating up the situation once more.

Further on Azerbaijan Blockade of Armenia

904A0050A Yerevan KOMMUNIST in Russian 10 Oct 89 p 1-2

["Communique of the Armenian SSR State Committee for Statistics on Economic Losses Caused by the Blockade of the Republic" disseminated by the Armenian Press Agency]

[Text] As a result of the continuing blockade by Azerbaijan of the Armenian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] and the NKAO [Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast], losses of a moral, material, economic, and political nature, which are hard to remedy, are being inflicted on our country.

Since the night of 25 September, the railway window to our republic has opened somewhat. However, this phenomenon has not become a trend thus far. In 6 days (25 through 30 September), only 3,277 railway cars entered from our neighbor's direction, which amounts to a mere 40.8 percent of of the technical standard established (1,340 cars a day). Besides, fuel is still lacking among the freight received which paralyzes the process of unloading the freight and delivering it to specific consumers. Actually, the blockade has not been lifted; there is no certainty that it will be lifted soon because it has assumed new forms: Cars with foodstuffs and fuel are uncoupled, and construction materials arrive largely in a condition which makes them unfit for use.

All of this puts the national economy of the republic in a most difficult situation. In the process, our partners in other areas of the country and abroad suffer.

Virtually all sectors of the national economy of the republic are sustaining losses. The blockade is also affecting vital supplies to the populace. Specific economic losses in the main sectors are as follows.

Transportation and Material-Technical Supply

Compared to the norm, the republic failed to receive 28,100 cars with freight from the direction of the Azerbaijan SSR between 1 and 24 September; altogether in September 7,453 cars passed through the Norashen and Idzhevan contact points compared to 40,800 according to the norm. Various freight in the amount of 1,500,600 tons of freight was not received. During this period, only 723 cars with liquid bulk cargo arrived, or 9.3 percent of the norm, compared to which 318,500 tons of liquid bulk cargo were not received, including 52,000 tons of gasoline, 20,000 tons of diesel fuel, and 103,700 tons of heavy fuel oil for the TPO [expansion unknown] Armnefteprodukt. The Gossnab [State Committee for Material and Technical Supply] deliveries fell short by 38,600 cubic meters of lumber, 280,000 tons of cement, and 50,000 tons of rolled ferrous metals. Motor vehicle transportation also suffered perceptible losses due to the acute shortage of fuel; its losses amounted to more than R12 million in profits.

The Agroindustrial Complex

Due to the blockade imposed by Azerbaijan, the progress of agricultural work in the republic worsened considerably. Thus, in the period between 20 August 1989 and 1 October 1989, the lack of fuel and lubricants and of the means of transportation rendered impossible the timely harvesting of grains on 2,000 hectares, corn on 2,400 hectares, and vegetables on 1,400 hectares; sown and natural grass was not mowed on more than 7,000 hectares. Over 20,000 tons of silage and 1,500 tons of grass meal were not procured, and so on.

The harvesting and preparation of fodder, the sowing of winter crops, and the opening up of land for fall plowing are being delayed. Mineral fertilizer was not received, and winter crops were sown without applying it.

In the Northern Caucasus, 150,000 tons of straw were to be procured; 90,000 tons were actually procured; due to the closure of railway tracks, only 9,200 tons were shipped.

The milk produced by farms has not been picked up by procurement organizations for a long time. Taking into account the fact that the farms of the republic are not fully equipped with refrigeration facilities, the grade and quality of milk are declining. Losses due to this have come to about R0.6 million. Due to the spoilage of other perishable foodstuffs (especially vegetables and grapes), losses due to the same reasons amounted to R0.7 million.

The situation which has emerged has influenced in a highly unfavorable manner the fulfillment of the plan of procuring agricultural products. Thus, as of 1 October 1989, the plan for procuring potatoes was 40.1 percent fulfilled, for procuring vegetables—60.6 percent, for procuring fruit—42.0 percent, melons—60.0 percent, grapes—20.5 percent, and grains—66. 2 percent. During

the blockade, the republic failed to procure 32,000 tons of fruits, 35,000 tons of vegetables, 30,000 tons of grapes, and so forth.

The supply of agricultural products to the population of the republic is unsatisfactory. Thus, during this period, the republic failed to receive from the all-union stocks 5,000 tons of potatoes, 5,000 tons of melons, 3,000 tons of onions, 100 tons of garlic, 2,600 tons of meat (slaughter weight), 3,800 tons of butter, 3,800 standard boxes of dairy products. In recent days, 80 tons of potatoes have been received which are completely spoiled due to long delays en route and are not suitable for table use. Due to the shortage of gasoline, almost no agricultural products from the farms and the populace are brought to the republic market. During the days of the blockade, 4,000 tons of potatoes, 5,000 tons of vegetables, 500 tons of fruit, and 1,000 tons of grapes from the fields did not reach the network of retail outlets.

The above became the reason for a considerable price increase in the markets of the republic.

The republic failed to provide for the all-union stocks 2,860 tons of fruit, 2,500 tons of grapes, and 3,600 tons of vegetables worth a total of R1.5 million.

Supply of Necessities to the Populace

As a result of the protracted blockade of highways and railways by the Azerbaijan SSR, foodstuffs worth more than R18 million did not reach the republic, including R8 million worth of sugar and R1 million worth of fish and fish products. Canned products, meat, butter and vegetable oil, flour, coffee, matches, and so forth accounted for the remaining R8 million worth of goods not delivered.

For the same reason, non-food goods worth over R100 million were not delivered of which construction materials for the populace accounted for R27 million, footwear for R17 million, clothing for R5 million, drugs for R3.7 million, and so forth.

In addition, the shortage of fuel in the republic has brought about disruptions in the supply of necessities to the republic, especially in the supply of foodstuffs for the populace.

Thus, foodstuffs worth more than R20 million failed to reach retail outlets—vitally important products such as baked goods worth R2.4 million, butter worth R1.5 million, macaroni products worth more than R0.6 million, vegetable oil worth R1 million, and flour and cereals worth about R1 million.

The shelves of stores have become noticeably emptier; long lines for bread and cereals have formed. No rice, macaroni products, matches, and other goods are sold.

Services worth a total of about R2 million were not rendered to the populace of the republic.

Industry

Compared to the production programs of enterprises, the overall loss of production in the industry of the republic for the period from the beginning of the blockade amounted to R176 million, of which R110 million occurred in September. During the same period, consumers failed to receive products worth R130 million (including R60 million worth from other regions of the country), of which products worth R103 million were not shipped in September.

As of 1 October 1989, the Luys Association failed to receive materials worth R7.0 million, and the stocks remaining would only suffice for 5 to 6 days of operation, including the paint for brass and steel for 1 or 2 days. Finished products worth R8.0 million which could not be shipped to the consumers had accumulated. Penalties for the breach of contracts amounted to R1.2 million.

At the Armelektromash Association, some types of stocks have been depleted. In September products worth R14 million were not shipped to the consumers.

Enterprises of the Ministry of Grain Products have failed to receive 600 tons of flour, 1,300 tons of cereals, and 30,400 tons of grain raw materials.

In September enterprises of the Gosagroprom [State Agroindustrial Committee] failed to ship to consumers outside the republic 20 million bottles of mineral water, 500 tons of table salt, wine materials worth R500,000 to be bottled at plants in Moscow, Saratov, and Leningrad, and cognac for exports worth 50,000 foreign-currency rubles.

On the whole, the Ministry of Light Industry of the republic failed to deliver products worth a total of R14.5 million to consumers in September.

According to the data of a flash survey, considerable stocks of manufactured consumer goods have accumulated at enterprise warehouses which cannot be brought to the consumers both inside and outside the republic due to the blockade.

In particular, there is no opportunity to ship to the consumers in other regions of our country 4,900 tape recorders, 24,000 3-channel speakers, 875 Desna washing machines, 132,000 household clocks, 1,088 radio alarm clocks, and a number of other cultural, housekeeping, and household goods in short supply. Within the system of the Ministry of Light Industry of the republic, goods worth R42 million are awaiting shipment to other republics, goods worth R21 million in the system of the Ministry of Local Industry, and goods worth R1 million in the TPO Armlesprom. On the whole (as of 1 October 1989) various consumer goods worth about R90 million in retail prices were ready for shipment beyond the republic, of which there were R15 million at enterprises reporting to the union and R75 million in products of the enterprises reporting to the

ministries and departments of the republic. Under the circumstances which have emerged, it appears expedient to sell these products (many of which are in extremely short supply) inside the republic.

As far as the fulfillment of the plan for the third quarter and the plan for 9 months, they were underfulfilled considerably. In industry as a whole, the plan for January through December, without taking into account revisions in deliveries (in January through August), was underfulfilled by 6.3 percent with the non-delivery of products amounting to about R348.2 million. Taking the revisions (except those in September) into account, the plan was underfulfilled by 3.8 percent, or R204.0 million. The volume of production amounted to 89 percent of that in the same period of last year.

Construction

The progress of construction in the disaster area is in a catastrophic state. Organizations participating in the post-earthquake restoration work in Armenia have suffered considerable losses due to the discontinuation of the hauling of freight arriving by rail through the Azerbaijan SSR.

A large amount of freight for construction organizations has not been delivered. The unavailability of construction and raw materials, motor fuel, and so on has actually brought about the stoppage of construction work in the disaster area and a mass outflow of workers from union republics.

Thus, in Artikskiy Rayon, the Belagropromstroy Trust did not receive 24 cars with lumber (1,920 cubic meters), steel frames (120 tons), bricks (200,000 pieces), 32 cars with concrete (790,000 cubic meters), one car with lime (58 tons), two cars with roofing slate (120,000 square meters), gasoline (351 tons), and diesel fuel (1,439 tons); the idle time of equipment amounted to 320 vehicle-shifts. The Litarmenstroy Association failed to receive a total of 300 cars, including 23 cars with cement (2,500 tons), bricks (900,000 pieces), steel frames (170 tons), two cars with lumber (100 cubic meters), and pipes (2,000 meters).

For the city of Leninakan 54,000 tons of cement, 8,600 tons of metal, 4,000 tons of pipes, and 117,000 tons of other materials were not received; for the city of Kirovakan, 19,300 tons of cement, 700 tons of metal, and 56,000 tons of other materials; for Spitak, 730 tons of cement, 168 tons of metal, 1,400 tons of other materials; for other rayon seats and settlements, 2,900 tons of cement, 672 tons of metal, and 5,400 tons of other materials. In total, the disaster area did not receive 127,000 tons of cement, 12,100 tons of metal, 4,000 tons of pipes, and 178,000 tons of other materials.

The following amounts of construction and assembly work were not carried out due to the incomplete deliveries of freight: in the city of Leninakan, 30.8 million rubles' worth; in Kirovakan, 11 million rubles' worth; in the city of Spitak, 3.3 million rubles' worth; and in other rayon seats and settlements, 13.2 million rubles' worth. In total, the volume of construction and assembly work in the disaster area was underfulfilled by R108.3 million. The overspending of the remuneration fund due to idle time in organizations from outside the republics amounted to R21,200.

The idle time of construction equipment and motor vehicles due to the lack of fuel and lubricants in the disaster area amounted to 193,200 vehicle-shifts which brought about the loss of R13.5 million.

Housing with a total area of houses in the amount of 99,700 square meters was not commissioned.

Thus, despite the efforts made, the blockade is in progress. A total of various material and technical resources worth over R70 million was not received during all the days of the blockade through the organizations of the Gossnab alone (taking transit into account), including 88,000 tons of rolled ferrous metals, 5,500 tons of rolled nonferrous metals, 5.0 [as published] tons of steel pipes, products of machinebuilding worth R9.8 million, chemical and petrochemical products worth R5.0 million, various goods worth R3.5 million, 100,900 cubic meters of timber, and 3,080 trailer homes. Standard and above-standard stocks of many types of merchandise in retail outlets have been virtually exhausted; for many of them, state reserves are being tapped.

Yuriy Afanasyev on Gorbachev Criticism

PM1411143489 Paris LE QUOTIDIEN DE PARIS in French 9 Nov 89 p 20

[Interview with Yuriy Afanasyev, Soviet people's deputy and rector of the Historical Archives Institute, by Georges Dupoy—date and place not given]

[Excerpt] [Introductory passage omitted]

[LE QUOTIDIEN] It seems that Mr Gorbachev threatened indirectly to expel you from the CPSU?

[Afanasyev] That is true. It happened at a meeting of Soviet newspaper editors. I was not there, but I was told about it. Mr Gorbachev read some extracts from articles which I wrote recently. In conclusion, he exclaimed: "I do not know how the Central Committee commission and the Moscow committee can tolerate Yuriy Afanasyev as a party member, how can he work on reforming the Institute [Historical Archives Institute]?"

We are currently passing through a transitional period between two stages of perestroyka in the USSR. The initial phase which began in 1985 is over. Throughout that period, perestroyka was regarded in terms of reconstructing the building constructed over 70 years without having to touch the foundations. It is now clear that this is impossible without also changing the foundations. The problem is that we do not know how to go about it. Opinions differ. There is a polarization of positions,

even among those who see the reforms in a socialist perspective. But there are many people who reject any socialist perspective.

It is in this atmosphere of polarization that we must place the meeting during which Mr Gorbachev accused me of being antisocialist. Rest assured that I do not agree with that verdict. On the contrary, I am sure that I am seeking solutions, and means of building a productive socialism. The paradox of this situation is that thinking seriously about socialist perspectives is becoming dangerous.

[LE QUOTIDIEN] There seems to be a kind of power vacuum. What is Mr Gorbachev's position?

[Afanasyev] The policy proposed by Mr Gorbachev is the only conceivable one: democracy, reforms, changes. It is the start of real prospects. But Mr Gorbachev is not radical enough to impose the change. I think that he has recently been leaning toward the right and this may be dangerous for him and his line.

[LE QUOTIDIEN] Peresiroyka has not succeeded in overcoming old prejudices, and instead it has stirred up nationalism in the republics....

[Afanasyev] That is natural because the Soviet peoples have hitherto not had the opportunity of thinking in terms of independence. That did not happen under the czars or under Stalin.

[LE QUOTIDIEN] How will this end?

[Afanasyev] With independence for those republics, of course. I am not talking about complete independence but political independence at government level. Agreements must be reached among free and independent nation-states. I think that that will be done soon. The [Estonian] Supreme Soviet will publish a decree tomorrow declaring Stalin's annexation of Estonia in 1940 to be illegal. That should lead to the emancipation of that country which could shortly become the first independent republic in the USSR. I see nothing surprising in that.

[LE QUOTIDIEN] Will there not be resistance from Moscow?

[Afanasyev] There are of course many forces in Russia which are opposed to the independence movements. There are people's forces which say that they are ready to take up arms to maintain the country's integrity. Workers' fronts are being organized throughout the country. This is a wave of Russian nationalism which is growing and which some members of the apparatus hope to use to their own benefit against the national movements in the republics.

[LE QUOTIDIEN] Is there reason to fear a civil war?

[Afanasyev] It is difficult to make predictions and I hope that we will not reach that point. The Soviet people have experienced all kinds of civil war during their existence and I do not think they want to do that again. They have had too many unhappy experiences: armed confrontations, the arbitrary deportation of populations, imprisonment. There is the conflict between Armenians and Azerbaijanis, but it is not a civil war.

[LE QUOTIDIEN] Is there reason to fear a military intervention?

[Afanasyev] That is impossible.

Siberian Gas Pipeline Explodes; No Casualties

LD1611075289 Moscow TASS in English 0746 GMT 16 Nov 89

[Text] Norilsk, Northern Siberia November 16 TASS—A gas pipeline section 300 kilometers from Norlisk blew up in on the night of November 15.

The powerful explosion destroyed more than four kilometers of pipes and 11 valves.

According to preliminary information, the blast was caused by a sharp drop in air temperature from minus seven to minus 41 degrees centigrade.

There has been no word of casualties.

40 km Damaged

LD1511173189 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 15 Nov 89

[Text] A grave accident took place last night near the Messoyakha-Norilsk gas pipeline. Forty km of the main pipelines are no longer functional. According to specialists' estimations, the break in the pipes was caused by a sharp temperature drop. Over 24 hours it dropped from 7 degrees below zero down to 41. Thanks to timely and urgent measures, it was possible to keep gas in the pipes, thereby ensuring its emergency supply. However, this quantity is inadequate, and the thermal station and some enterprises have already started using diesel fuel. This amount will last for 10 days. Still, the Norilsk mining and metallurgy combine which are technologically linked with operations using natural gas had to be run at half capacity. The town's supply of heat will be somewhat restricted.

A headquarters has been set up and has undertaken the coordination of operations related to the situation. Specialists have already left for the pipeline area and repair workers from Urengoy are heading there to give assistance. The situation has been aggravated by the fact that the tundra has not yet frozen deep enough to allow sledge and tractor convoys to pass. The media is promptly informing residents of the north on the situation at the site of the accident. Attention has been drawn to the need to use hot water and heat sparingly.

Reshaping of CPSU Statutes Discussed

PM1511162189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Nov 89 Second Edition p 2

[Article by Ye. Razumov, first deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee Party Building and Cadre Work Department, and Doctor of Historical Sciences N. Zolotarev, leader of a group of Central Committee department consultants: "What Should the Statutes Be Like. Statutes of the Party of Perestroyka. Not Amendments, But Rejection of Old Dogmas and Illusions. Renewed Party for Renewed Society. 'It Is Easy To Compose Nicely Written Paragraphs...' Fewer Prohibitions—More Creativity"]

[Text] The years of perestroyka have given the party multifaceted political experience which could not have been acquired in even decades of placid existence. A start has been made in the difficult process of regaining the party's Leninist image. This process went through several stages: The 27th CPSU Congress, which gave scope for cleansing the party of the mildew and negative aspects of the past and radically restructuring party work; the 19th All-Union Party Conference, which emphasized the separation of party and soviet functions and on political methods of party leadership; the report and election campaigns held in party organizations after the conference and under the influence of its ideas; and the elections of USSR people's deputies.

Having proposed a new strategy and tactics in 1985, the party was bound to restructure also its internal procedures and its style and methods of work. Let us recall that all-around democratization was called upon to be the main guideline for the urgent transformations. From the very beginning this was dictated by the concept of perestroyka, was the foundation of the documents regulating party life, and was reflected in the statutes adopted by the 27th CPSU Congress. The additions and amendments to the statutes were aimed at enhancing the vanguard role of Communists and the combat ability of primary party organizations and at developing internal party democracy.

The renewed normative base at that stage was in line with the ideas prevalent in the CPSU at the time. But the need to ensure the party's leadership role [lidiruyushchaya rol] in perestroyka and the need for its self-development demanded more than that. The CPSU Central Committee January (1987) Plenum introduced amendments to the mechanism for constituting the leading party organs, advocated multiple candidacies, and introduced secret ballots for the election of party committee secretaries by plenums.

The 19th All-Union Party Conference produced even greater advances toward democratization, going beyond the framework of statutory regulations. It is well known that the party conference set the task of fully restoring Lenin's perception of the principle of democratic centralism, collegial discussion, and decisionmaking, of ensuring openness in the work of party organizations and their leadership organs and the latter's regular accountability to Communists. Furthermore, party organizations were given the right to nominate candidate members of higher-ranking organs when electing conference or congress delegates, and this is proving fully justified. Provision was also made to limit Communists' tenure in elected positions, to reorganize the party apparatus, to abandon the formal nomenklatura approach toward the selection and placement of cadres, and other fundamentally important measures of a democratic nature.

The effect of these innovations was to launch democratization along avenues of party work which hitherto had been considered perfectly satisfactory. The CPSU Central Committee recently adopted a detailed resolution "On Party Organizations' Work To Consolidate Their Ranks and Renew the CPSU's Composition in Conditions of Deepening Perestroyka and Political Reform" following submissions by its Commission on Questions of Party Building and Cadre Policy which, by the way, is one of the new democratic formations. This resolution substantially changes approaches toward the shaping of the party's ranks and brings the practice of admission to the CPSU in line with the level of perestroyka's political realities. Proposals on democratizing work with cadres and overcoming formalism and diktat in this work have now been prepared and examined by the CPSU Central Committee Commission.

Let us be blunt: The measures taken following the 27th congress promote perestroyka within the party, but they are obviously inadequate at present. In the conditions of democratization and glasnost, the party must assert its right to exercise political leadership in society by the example of profound renewal of its own organization. It is universally recognized that a party which is undergoing renewal must operate in a society which is undergoing renewal. Furthermore, as the CPSU Central Committee September (1989) Plenum noted, the processes of the party's renewal and improvement of its methods of action must proceed faster than the processes occurring within society.

As yet, unfortunately, party organizations are still under the influence of social inertia among a sizeable proportion of Communists, frozen internal party relations, and corporate isolation, all of which are the legacy of the times of stagnation. This is giving rise to growing criticism within society and generating dissatisfaction among CPSU members. Hence the main point is to awaken Communists' social activeness without which the party will simply find itself unable to perform the role of political vanguard, to resolutely restore the Leninist norms and democratic customs within itself, and to revive the best traditions of bolshevism.

Of course, it is also necessary to bring the laws governing party life into line with these tasks so as to ensure that they help to create an atmosphere of genuine democratism and comradeship in all its components and to really enable each and every Communist to—in Lenin's words—participate on an equal footing and

without any exception in the affairs of his own organization and of the party as a whole. It is noteworthy that a flood of proposals on amendments to the statutes arrived even during the period of preparations for the 19th conference. This flood has recently swollen further still. Essentially, they raise the question of creating statutes which would reflect the spirit of our revolutionary time and would stimulate restructuring of the party. The authors of these proposals justifiably call for more than just resting content with partial improvements, they call for progress along the path of elaborating substantially different statutory provisions and normatives. Indeed the Central Committee September plenum had the creation of new statutes in mind when it suggested that this question be included on the 28th CPSU Congress agenda. Significant progress is to be achieved here, as well as in other spheres of perestroyka transformations.

This approach appears perfectly justified because it is dictated by current realities and is in line with long-term tasks. It is justified because the evolution [dvizheniye] of party life no longer fits within the prevailing organizational-statutory framework, its has outgrown it. Let us also bear this in mind: The foundations of the current CPSU Statutes were laid almost 3 decades ago, and subsequently were only augmented by sundry regulations, ending up overloaded by details which have seriously hindered their creative application. And many of the statutes' weaknesses are rooted in the even more distant past, when the administrative edict system was taking shape and hold.

But in what way did the statutes differ in Lenin's time? They were documents which laid down only the fundamental aspects of the organizational building of the working class' leading detachment geared to fully revealing the creative energy of the party, of each of its organizations, of all Communists.

Later on, and especially since the early thirties, the transformation of the statutes took the avenue of increasing regulation of party life and intensification of its centralization. The duties of party members were laid down in detail, and there were prescriptions of how they should think and act in almost all eventualities presented by life. Emphasis on execution of instructions and unquestioning obedience gradually became the dominant feature. With the passage of time there was a steady curbing of opportunities for the realization of the individual's social needs within the party ranks, and the principle of party organizations' autonomy became deformed. All this suited the interests of the administrative edict system, of course, but this path led to the blind alley of bureaucratism and excessive regimentation, transforming party members into the notorious "cogs" and party committees into command centers.

People wish to see the party as an expression of the supreme and most consistent form of democratism, one could say an example of democratic development for the whole of society. The CPSU is not sworn to democracy just in order to curb it in its own ranks. Who else if not the CPSU should primarily ensure all conditions for fearless comparison of views and expression of alternative viewpoints while maintaining unity on questions of principle?

The statutes have always been the party's instrument for resolving tasks posed by the times. Today they must be an instrument of the party of perestroyka. Of course, this does not at all mean that it is necessary to totally reject the current statutes. When you are curing a tree you do not hack away its roots. Would it be sensible to reject statutory provisions which have passed the test of time and have affirmed that they are viable and necessary today? It seems very important to enshrine in the new statutes, in parallel with these provisions, everything useful that party organizations have adopted in the last few years, that offers scope for the CPSU's further democratization, and that is in line with its innovative nature as a party of revolutionary actions.

Briefly speaking, the new statutes must be rooted in life, and this is probably not doubted by anyone. Therefore, there is no need to depart from the contemporary political reality whereby we have a single-party system and—as the first Congress of USSR People's Deputies resolution most definitely emphasized—the CPSU is the ruling party, society's political playing plays an important consolidating role.

To successfully cope with this role, the party must function as an ideologically homogenous, united, and cohesive political organization. The statutes, which regulate party life, must be in line with this task. Only those who would wish to weaken the party's unity, erode its ideological foundations, and destroy the alliance of like-minded people beneath the banner of struggle against "uniform thinking" are groundlessly criticizing the party's customs and targeting their efforts on the very foundations of the statutes inherited by the CPSU from V.I. Lenin. This approach is destructive. It is unacceptable to the party and enjoys no support in society.

We are firmly convinced: There is no other social force in the country, apart from the Communist Party, capable of leading perestroyka without serious upheavals, ensuring its irreversibility, and rallying society around the fundamental values of socialism and the loyalty of the multinational union's working people to their historical choice. This has to be said in view of the emergence of preachers of a different path of development based on negation of our system, the removal of the Communist Party from its political role, and domination by private ownership and other values which have been rejected by the people. But what if such a "preacher" holds a CPSU membership card? He would obviously be better off in some other organization. In any event, the new statutes would hardly be able to reconcile such beliefs with party-mindedness. As far as the CPSU is concerned, a single program and a single set of statutes are imminently inherent attributes. It is no accident that, ever

since the party was founded, recognition of these attributes has been a mandatory condition of party membership.

We would not wish to be misunderstood, as if we were trying to say that it is necessary to "hold the line" when drafting the statutes. Quite the contrary. All provisions in the statutes, including fundamental ones, must be painstakingly examined in pursuit of their improvement. Take for example the principle of democratic centralism. We assume that it will be retained as reflecting the real needs of people who are voluntarily united in a political organization to achieve common goals. V.I. Lenin perceived its strength as lying in the dialectical unity of democratism and centralism, and introduced it in the statutes soon after the party was founded. But the 17th congress reduced this fundamental principle to just a few provisions designed to promote the utmost centralization of party life. Past formulations have been preserved almost unaltered to this day and have turned into a scheme which is far removed from the CPSU's real needs. Even the fact that the 27th congress added a paragraph about collectiveness in work and Communists' personal responsibility failed to eliminate the substantial tilt toward centralism to the detriment of democracy.

The new perception of the principle of democratic centralism makes it impossible to reduce everything to just a single paragraph. Its different aspects should probably be reflected to a certain extent in many of the statutes' sections. We have to restore Lenin's understanding of the principle of democratic centralism, which presupposes a meaningful life for all party organizations and Communists and their real autonomy, conscientious discipline, and unity of actions based on the elaboration of common political and ideological positions.

Of course, it will be necessary to find a democratic solution to the problem of freedom of discussion and unity of actions, of respect for the opinion of the minority and of individual Communists alike. It is well known that administrative edict methods of leadership in the past precluded the elaboration of alternative solutions and ignored the minority's opinion. Many Communists are now advocating that all points of view be taken into account when making decisions, that the minority—while participating in the fulfillment of a decision made by the majority —can criticize it and uphold their position. Indeed, this is the only way to extract rational kernels from the most extraordinary opinions and to pave the way for innovation.

Comprehensive consideration of different viewpoints and genuine collegiality when solving emerging questions will provide a reliable basis for boosting the organization and strengthening the unity of party ranks. The question of strengthening discipline, but on a democratic basis, and of enhancing responsibility is a most vital question in society and in the party. The statutes' provisions must be better targeted in this direction. They certainly should contain guarantees against personality cults, voluntarism, subjectivism, bureaucratism, and other phenomena which are alien to the party.

All sections of the statutes should be checked to make sure they correspond with the party's democratic nature. It would be in line with the spirit of the time and with objective needs if we were to relieve them of unnecessary regulatory provisions. Fewer prohibitions and restrictions, greater opportunities for creative activity, lively collegial work, bold thinking, and resolute action —this, in our view, is what the new statutes ought to be like.

It would be natural for the statutes to lay down the rights of party organizations taking into account society's federal structure. The CPSU platform "On the Party's Nationalities Policy in Present-Day Conditions" formulated a whole series of provisions concerning republic party organizations. In this context, maybe the CPSU Statutes ought to contain a special section on union republic communist parties defining their status and substantially expanding their rights and autonomy.

The majority of participants in the debate now under way agree that the party as a whole cannot be built on a federal or confederal principle: This would cause irreparable damage to the CPSU's ideological and organizational unity and would weaken the USSR's foundation. Union republic communist parties are inalienable components of the CPSU, their activity is guided by the CPSU Program and Statutes, and they ensure the fulfillment of CPSU Central Committee decisions within their republics' borders. They are called upon to strive for the best possible combination of the interests of national state formations and the country as a whole, to take into account the region's specific features, to play the role of active champions and guarantors of Soviet society's ideological and moral consolidation, and to wage an uncompromising struggle against any manifestations of parochialism, nationalism, and chauvinism.

It is proposed that the role of republic communist parties be enhanced in the elaboration of the party's overall strategy and tactics on questions of the country's internal development, foreign policy, and the international communist and workers movement, that they be delegated rights in deciding organizational, financial, and cadre questions and determining the structure and staffing of party committee apparatuses, and so on. As a matter of fact, all this is a topic for further debates and the elaboration of new statutory provisions.

To imagine that restructuring of the party can be accomplished without substantially enhancing the role of its primary organizations is just an illusion. These organizations comprise the party's base, and therefore they ought to occupy a central position in the statutes. It is important to ensure that the statutes substantially expand the rights of primary organizations in the sphere of shaping and implementing party policy and that, through all their provisions, the statutes affirm an atmosphere of initiative, comradeship, and implacability

toward sycophancy and rank. There is a pressing need to free primary organizations from tutelage from above and to give them a guaranteed opportunity to operate along the tracks of party policy as autonomous political formations—free and unfettered, without looking over their shoulder at the apparatus. The cause could only benefit from this. A party organization is capable of operating responsibly and efficiently only when it autonomously interprets all processes in society, in its own labor collective and region. Every Communist in such an organization would be able to feel that he is an active political fighter.

This, by the way, is important also for the following reason. It is an open secret that there are increasingly frequent cases of withdrawal from the party ranks, and fewer applications for CPSU membership than before. There are numerous reasons for this. There is, however, one fine point which is perhaps underestimated by many: Today's political life in society and the socialist pluralism which is taking hold in it enable extraordinary and active personalities to play their part in life also outside the party ranks. How should we react to this? By following a simple logic: Let us create within the party conditions which would attract politically active people and enable them to fully blossom within the party and to serve the idea of renewal more fruitfully than if they were outside its ranks.

Nonetheless, it does not seem worthwhile to us to have the new statutes offering detailed prescriptions on questions of primary party organizations' building and activity. It is necessary to have greater trust in Communists. It is time to delegate to primary organizations more rights in solving problems of augmenting the party ranks with new members and terminating CPSU membership, including the examination of applications for voluntary resignation. Some comrades propose that candidate membership be left as the "exclusive" right of primary organizations, and this is being tested by way of an experiment in several oblasts. Another opinion suggests altogether abandoning the institution of candidate membership and stepping up party organizations' work on preparing people for joining the CPSU. But in all cases—and this is in line with the spirit of the time—it is intended to ensure real influence by labor collectives on the shaping of the party ranks.

Many people express specific views on democratization of the electoral process in primary organizations. Like, for example, electing bureau and committee secretaries through direct secret ballot by meeting participants or conference delegates—on a multiple candidacy basis, without fail. Some people believe that grass-roots components must participate not only in the nomination of candidates for election to rayon or city committees but also in the shaping of party organs at all levels and in the composition of conference and congress delegates.

There are, in our view, good reasons for raising the question of primary organizations' participation in constituting the party apparatus, of officials' accountability to the organizations which have nominated them, and of party organizations' more active role in the selection and promotion of leadership cadres. In all probability, it will hardly be possible to restructure work with cadres without primary organizations' direct participation in this work. It is quite likely that some people might object, claiming that the current statutes do give them the right to such participation. Yes, they do. But this right is certainly not always exercised. It is, by the way, laid down in the statutes only in a declarative form.

Is it not an alarming fact that the process of internal party relations' recovery is still progressing only very slowly in many primary organizations? Excessive regimentation in work, timidity toward administrators, scorn for the opinion of Communists who frequently feel that they are not the masters of their organization —labor collectives are especially acutely sensitive to all this in present-day conditions. This is true of party members themselves and of nonparty people alike. It is an open secret that people with party membership cards in their pockets do not always set an example for those around them at work and in daily life, at times adopt a passive stance, evade raising and discussing acute issues, and fear changes. People are perfectly justified in advocating the intensification of statutory demands regarding Communists' moral makeup and their role in humanizing relations between people and augmenting universal values.

We must not, however, forget V.I. Lenin's warning about "cramming the statutes with a multitude of paragraphs." "It is easy to write flowery paragraphs," Vladimir Ilich warned, "but most of them prove superfluous in practice. The statutes must not end up as an anthology of wishful thinking...." This means that it is impossible to prescribe every step to be taken by Communists or every action by party organizations.

We would especially like to dwell on the party's relations with various social forces, state structures, and economic organs. Any sectarianism, any tendency toward the party's self-imposed isolation, any authoritarianism would be simply fatal for the cause of perestroyka nowadays. At the same time, bearing in mind the separation of functions, the statutory provisions which tend toward direct management of public affairs and interference in the activity of nonparty organizations are unsuitable in their present form. The process of shifting real power into the hands of people represented by the soviets and people's growing social activeness dictate that the provisions and norms of the new CPSU Statutes should not contain any claims by party organizations and committees to a monopoly of truth or to complete sway over the solution of all questions of domestic and foreign policy and of state and social life. It is evident that this should be primarily a matter of active political cooperation with state and social organizations and movements. The party is called upon to influence them through the Communists functioning within these organizations, to influence them by striving for coordinated positions and aiming for social consensus on the basis of dialogue and consideration of interests.

Work on studying and summing up proposals for the new statutes is now being done in the CPSU Central Committee and its commissions and departments. The stepping up of this work was the topic of conversation at a recent sitting of the CPSU Central Committee Commission for Questions of Party Building and Cadre Policy. An action plan was laid down. Much importance attached to glasnost in the collective work now under way. Taking its creative and informal nature into account, it is intended to ensure the creation of conditions for a frank exchange of opinions and consultation on all issues with competent people from among social scientists, party aktiv members, and authors of alternative drafts. It is, of course, very difficult to overestimate the role to be played by the mass media in this work.

Nowadays it would be simply impermissible to produce the statutes as was done in the past, through efforts by a narrow circle of professional party officials. This, we repeat, is a question of collective work. It is only by pooling efforts during the debate which is already under way in the party and society that we can arrive at correct answers to the questions raised by life and elaborate clear-cut statutory provisions in line with the commandments of the time and the tasks concerning the party's renewal.

Economic

Basis for Joint Ventures Becoming 'Broader'

AU3110154489 Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE in German 28 Oct 89 p 14

["FZ" report: "Moscow Wants To Simplify East-West Trade"]

[Excerpt] Frankfurt, 27 October—Wolfgang Roeller, spokesman of Dresdner Bank's board of directors, considers the prospects for East-West trade to be favorable. On the occasion of the ninth meeting of the German-Soviet Bank Commission in Frankfurt, Roeller pointed to the recent positive developments. He said that in the first 6 months of 1989, German trade with East Europe (not including inner-German trade) increased by almost 30 percent to DM12 billions. Together with Yuriy S Moskovskiy, chairman of the board of directors of the USSR Foreign Trade Bank, Roeller heads this bank committee.

The basis for cooperation is becoming "broader and broader" as a consequence of the Soviet reform policy, Roeller said. The establishment of joint ventures in the USSR is further promoting economic relations. Thus, the commission has dealt with questions of accounting and drawing up of balance sheets of joint ventures. According to Moskovskiy, the new Soviet laws have made it possible for more than 1,000 joint ventures to be concluded, more than 150 of which with German enterprises. Following the devaluation of the ruble in private money exchange, the USSR wants to considerably simplify the complicated settlement of accounts in East-West trade. According to Moskovskiy, the number of so-called special goods, for which there exist some 2,000 different surcharges to the official exchange rate of the ruble, is to be considerably reduced. After the planned price reform, the principles for determining a new exchange rate of the Soviet currency are to be established, probably in 1991. [passage omitted]

Development of Energy-Conserving Sources Stressed

904E0019A Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 28 Oct 89 p 2

[Interview with USSR People's Deputy S. Lashchenov, chief of the Hydroelectric Power Plant Construction Association of the USSR Ministry of Power and Electrification: "The Light and Shadows of Hydroelectric Power," by TASS correspondent L. Levin; date, place, and occasion not specified; first two paragraphs are SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA introduction]

[Text] "They destroy nature and have no kinship with normal people," "barbarians," "vermin"—it is just such epithets that are being conferred upon our hydroelectric power plant construction personnel these days. Public opinion, actively aroused by excessive emotional oratory in various regions of the country, has manifestly been opposed to the branch personnel. Erection of several very important hydroelectric power facilities has been frozen. Capital investments in the branch for next year have been cut 42 percent in the interests of the country's financial recuperation.

All the same, we are confronted with a sober evaluation of the state of affairs: A number of speeches at the First USSR Congress of People's Deputies rang out serious and well-founded alarm over the development of entire regions. It was not without purpose that People's Deputy N. Amosov posed the question: "Well, what are we going to eat, wear, and read? How are we going to light and heat our homes?" Really. This is the topic of conversation between USSR People's Deputy S. Lashchenov, chief of the Gidroenergostroy [Hydroelectric Power Plant Construction] Association of the USSR Ministry of Power and Electrification, and TASS correspondent L. Levin.

[Levin] Semen Yakovlevich, you recently headed the association and have undergone the trial by fire of elections. Judging from the fact that you spend most of your time on official trips, the situation in the branch must be far from ideal.

[Lashchenov] I became engaged in the hydroelectric power sphere immediately after completing the institute. I began as a foreman in construction of the Votkinskaya Hydroelectric Power Plant (GES). Then came the GES cascade in Tajikistan, and work in Cuba. I assumed the position of association director coming from the trust "Tadzhikgidroenergostroy [Tajik Hydroelectric Power

Construction]," which I headed later on. I have a reason for mentioning my biography. I know full well the problems of the branch, its illnesses. It has been my life.

I do not wish to defend the honor of the uniform. Truly, we have piled up so much in times gone by that to this day we have not managed to disentangle it. But we must not run to another extreme, take up a position of complete denial or prohibition. Now we hear appeals ringing out to completely get rid of power plants. Is this right?

We know that the GES is the most economic and ecologically clean source of electric power. In the developed capitalist countries—the United States, France, Sweden, and Japan—75 to 90 percent of hydropower resources have been exploited. At the same time, deposits of oil and gas which have been located are being preserved. People there are thinking about the future, about coming generations. We are utilizing only 20 percent of the energy potential of our rivers and we know the reason for this. In the 1950's, in the hopes of achieving a quick victory in our economic competition with capitalism, we relied on thermal electric power stations. But the situation today has changed little. As a result of disruption of the government's hydroelectric power program for 1981-1990, the country is continually losing up to a half billion rubles.

The situation with regard to provision of electrical power in the country is catastrophic. Its constant shortage is felt in the Ukraine, the North Caucasus, and Transcaucasus. There is a real danger that these regions will soon be joined by the central and northwest RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic], the Urals, and the Far East. Because of insufficient power in Central Asia—and usually this occurs in the winter—many enterprises have days off in the middle of the week. Naturally people are uncomfortable—this interrupts their life rhythm....

[Levin] Press reports indicate that society is demanding the termination of 35 electric power stations presently operating or under construction, comprising an overall energy capacity of more than 60 million kilowatts. This amounts to just short of one-fourth of the country's energy potential today. The USSR currently occupies 20th place in the world with regard to per capita consumption of electric energy. A sharp reduction in the construction of electric power plants will be a great step backward. What do you do? Where is that "golden means" by which you can augment power without harming nature or man himself?

[Lashchenov] I am convinced that we must develop all types of energy sources—sun, wind, and geothermal waters can partially fill the existing deficit. Without a doubt, safe exploitation of atomic energy will undergo maximum development. But I repeat: Hydroelectric power plants are the most accessible and cheapest producers of electrical energy. I agree with the concept of prohibiting GES construction in flat country, near major centers. These stations must be located in mountainous regions so they do not damage fertile lands. With the transition of entire regions to economic accountability, small stations on little rivers acquire special significance.

But some difficulties arise here—for a variety of reasons, machinebuilders manufacture practically no equipment for the small GES. New forms of economic management are presenting broad prospects for local organs of authority. With funds and favorable electric power rates at their disposal, they can use their discretion in selecting station design. Precise economic accountability and long-range vision acquire a special role here. The local regions must know exactly how much energy they will require in 5, 10, 30 years.

Let me cite another example. In comparison with the stations on the Volga, the new-generation GES is capable of dozens of times reducing the flooded zone, as was the case with the Sangtudinskaya GES on the Vakhsh River. Here it was originally planned to submerge a fertile valley. But then an original technological decision was made: Instead of erecting one giant dam, they would erect two medium-sized ones. As a result, only the river canyon is subject to submersion. Today we have good station designs available. But instead of discussing them on a broad scale and analyzing them in detail, we hear the categorical demands: "Ban them." Another campaign; more dashing about.

[Levin] So we are confronted with the tangible reality that we may have a severe energy shortage. And we ourselves may be the originators of it. But what about energy-conserving technology? Will we never get beyond vociferous appeals?

[Lashchenov] Yes, if we do not take radical measures we will not escape the coming shortage. While introducing energy conservation technology on a broad scale, we must erect new power stations at the same time. This is being done throughout the world. Man, industry, any sphere of life—these are unthinkable without electric power, and more and more of it is required. The energy program to the year 2005 calls for an increase in hydropower plant capacity from 64 to 135 million kilowatts, or a 2.1-fold increase. Unfortunately, a one-sided approach to erecting new hydropower plants has played a role here—we see a certain social psychosis. Upon direction of the hydropower association, as a USSR people's deputy, I had to submit a letter to Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers N.I. Ryzhkov. For the decision was made to effect a three-fold reduction next year in the volume of construction and assembly projects.

It is proposed to put on hold 16 GES's currently under construction and freeze almost R1 billion of capital investment. This will lead to an immediate reduction in the reliability of energy supply as well as its deterioration. About 40,000 highly qualified hydropower construction specialists will be laid off. What difficulty was involved in establishing the labor collectives; experience was gained ounce by ounce over decades.

Residents of Nurek approached me as a deputy. Experts of the highest order, they had erected a most unique cascade of electric power stations. Naturally these people were alarmed. What are they to do now? Where will they live and work? Then, for example, what about the entire Central Asian region, with its colossal population growth and ever-increasing demand for new work sites? These shady sides of planning and treatment of hydroenergy supply will, alas, be immediately felt within the entire national economy in the very near future. It will be reflected especially painfully in collectives operating beyond the Arctic Circle, where they are erecting the Kureyskaya and Kolymskaya stations.

Action To Order 'Chaotic' Computer Market Urged

PM1411152189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 1

[Article by Yu. Kogtev: "Computer for Sale. What Is Needed Is a Unified Program to Provide the Country with Computer Technology]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] Why, despite the efforts of joint ventures and individual cooperatives, are personal computers still in the special goods category? When will computers be accessible not only to those returning from business trips abroad or those who have several tens of thousands of rubles to spare? I put these questions to I. Aleksandrov, general director of the "Kompas" joint venture.

Let me say a few words about the Soviet computer market, he said. I put it at around $500 million a year. We are doing business with hundreds of foreign firms and several joint ventures, not counting cooperatives which obtain computers in various roundabout ways. What is striking about the computer market? Our foreign trade organizations' amazing "omnivorousness." They buy everything that is offered to them, although prices for the same item can vary by 20-30 percent. When I worked in a large ministry I was involved in selecting equipment, and we did not even have a list of competitors in order to be able to compare offers from various firms. Instead, what one usually had was instructions from "on high" to approach a particular firm.

What happens as a result of uncoordinated purchasing practices? The result is that major firms are not doing business with us. It is mainly small entrepreneurs who come, compensating for the risk by raising their prices considerably. In some cases by 50 percent and sometimes even more.

Of course, given such a chaotic situation, it is hard to imagine that in the next few years we will be able to stem the tide of speculation in computer technology.

What is the answer? In my view, I. Aleksandrov continued, it is to set up joint ventures, but on the territory of the producer-countries. For instance, Poland sites its firms in Singapore. We could also become the owners, say, of 20 percent of the stocks of an enterprise and get our share of high-technology products. The advantage is that we thus become involved in an ongoing cycle of production renewal, in which equipment is due for replacement after a certain period. This is much better than wasting time and money on buying equipment, on repairs, cadre training, and so on.

Unless we see that we have to slot into the world economy and world system of the division of labor as quickly as possible, we are going to land ourselves with obsolete technology.

The general director's conclusion is that a major state program is needed to coordinate the efforts of the many organizations supplying the country's personal computers. But we do not even have a bulletin providing comparative data on the terms offered by suppliers. Hence the amazing, inexplicable price levels at which deals are made.

But the question "how do you buy a computer?" is only one side of the coin. The other side is: "What are you buying it for?" It is no secret that equipment is being extremely inefficiently utilized at many enterprises. It would be a pity if, of all the merits of computer technology, we learned to exploit only one in our Fatherland—the opportunity that this technology certainly gives to arbitrarily hike prices when settling with enterprises and organizations.

Deputy Examines Reasons for Rail Freight Problems

904H0041A Moscow GUDOK in Russian 31 Oct 89 p 1

[Article by USSR People's Deputy, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Commission for Transportation, Communications, and Data Management I. Zhdakayev: "Management Does Not Mean Bans"]

[Text] The situation which has emerged in railway transportation gives cause for alarm. According to the official data of the USSR Promstroybank [Industrial Construction Bank], the state is losing more than R10 billion annually in national income due to the unavailability of railway transportation services to the national economy.

There are many reasons for this. I believe that the imperfection of the management system of the industry which frequently brings about chaos and creates unpredictable difficulties is one of the foremost reasons.

The methods of planning transportation merit special attention. It is no secret that at present individual stations, sections, or entire railroads are either clogged with cars awaiting unloading or almost empty.

According to Article 44 of the Railroad Charter, the MPS [Ministry of Railways] may ban loading for individual directions if too many cars have accumulated there. This is a forced measure. Still, I believe that the very existence of this article reflects the inability of the industry headquarters to anticipate spontaneous processes.

For example, "The Rules for Planning the Haulage of Freight on the Railroads of the USSR" provide that freight shippers do not indicate the station of destination of the freight in their plans furnished to the railroad administration before the 1st of the month if haulage is going to be carried out within the confines of two or several railroads. These rules do not breathe a word about the shipper having to indicate a specific address of the freight recipient or his digital code. Given such initial data, any car unloading plans for stations are a mere convention; they may only be developed on the basis of "levels attained."

Therefore, at the stage of planning haulage the railroad employees do not quite have a clear idea of where and to whom they are going to haul freight in the coming month. Besides, the existing system of planning does not take into account one of the most important factors—the maximum technical handling capacity of freight-handling facilities of the recipients.

Proposals for changing planning procedures were stated in the newspaper PRAVDA by the current chief of the department of container traffic and commercial work of the Sakhalin Division of the Far East Railroad L. Khaynovskiy in the article "Dead Ends and Freight" as far back as 1979.

At the time, the USSR Gossnab [Committee for Material and Technical Supplies] did not support this idea arguing that the new system calls for augmenting the staff of employees involved in planning.

However, administrative operations may be reduced by simplifying documentation: The material and technical supply plan (it already exists) should be combined with the freight transportation plan on the same form. In the process, the format of this unified document should be made such as to be easily processed by computers.

To this day, the planning of haulage is done the old way. The example of our region shows what this brings about. The economy of Sakhalin suffers greatly from so-called "convention bans" because freight appears here at an extremely uneven rate in the course of the year. The MPS, the shippers, and the Gossnab alike do not get involved in managing its arrival at the island.

In February and March of almost every year, the minister of railways bans the shipment of freight to Sakhalin due to the great accumulation of cars on the Komsomolsk Division of the Far East Railroad. In 1989, five such bans have already been posted. It happens that sea ferries are idle due to the lack of cars with freight for Sakhalin.

The shippers of freight for the recipients of Sakhalin frequently evade financial responsibility for the breach of contract by referring to the MPS bans on shipment. In the process, it is virtually impossible to establish the genuine reason for the breach of contract even if the shipper did not have the products on hand.

It is necessary for the MPS to control the situation through its automated traffic management center in order to prevent the uncontrollable accumulation of cars being unloaded. The management center should provide authorizations or ban the loading at each station and by each freight shipper daily, on a day-by-day schedule for the entire month on the basis of 1-month and 10-day requests from freight shippers. The center should also communicate the reason for such a decision: For example, considerable idle time of cars being unloaded by the recipient.

I believe that specific culprits in forced bans will be found under such traffic management. At present, there is the injured party (recipients of freight), but there is no guilty party.

It is necessary to stress that the planning of freight transportation is a commercial issue. Unfortunately, the standard of commercial work on the railroads is not at all in line with present-day economic requirements. There aren't even appropriate departments at railroad higher schools. The prestige of commercial employees of our railroads is extremely low compared to specialists in economically developed countries.

Meanwhile, many managers of foreign railroad companies are commercial specialists whereas their assistants have the professions of railroad operations managers, railroad engineers, engine specialists, and so on. It is necessary to increase the role of commercial work in railroad transportation. This will also become a step on the road toward improving planning, and, therefore, more complete meeting of the transportation needs of our national economy.

Voronin Comments on Existing Supply Problems

904d0019A Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 8 Nov 89 p 2

[Statement by L. Voronin, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers: "An Answer for USSR People's Deputy A. Obolenskiy"]

[Text] Esteemed Aleksandr Mitrofanovich: In connection with your appeal to me through the newspaper SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA on 10 October this year, I can report that in fact USSR Council of Ministers instruction No 1416r dated 12 August 1989 was issued for the purpose of giving priority deliveries of raw materials for the production of soap and detergent. This was done because the acute shortages of these consumer goods are causing justified dissatisfaction among the population and increasing social tension in the country. This decision was a forced move of a temporary nature and was taken in view of the extraordinary nature of the situation.

Now to the essence of your appeal. For the "Transmash" Plant the situation with deliveries of bulk silicate has been normalized. During the first 10-day period of October, 368 tons of this raw material were unloaded at

the enterprise, which is the normal amount required each month. Unloading of bulk silicate at the "Transmash" Plant by the Vorginskiy glass plant in the amounts specified by contract has now been completed. The second supplier—the Kherson Glass Articles Plant—is implementing its plan for deliveries taking into account the making up of deliveries through the end of the year. This work has been placed under strict control. The plant plan for the first 9 months of the year for deliveries of castings to the "Kirovskiy" Plant has been fulfilled, and the 10-month plan will also be fulfilled. The present situation does not give cause for concern.

Thus, no threat of an interruption in operations at all other elements of the technological chain because of temporary supply shortfalls of bulk silicates actually exists.

I would like to note that the complications in supplying bulk silicate to the "Transmash" Plant arose before the 12 August instructions were issued and were the result of shortfalls in supplies of soda products from imports, and in this connection the necessary steps were taken to insure supplies of soda for construction materials enterprises in accordance with the targets for the production of glass and glass articles, including additional funding allocated for soda.

On the plane of possible appeals to me in the future I think that only a businesslike and constructive approach to existing problems is the proper approach. I am sure that only joint efforts and constructive work by all elements of the state and of society will help the labor collectives to build up their efforts aimed at improving the economy and solving the tasks of perestroyka in general.

I trust you will not take offense that I address you through the newspaper SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA, in which you published your letter.

Please excuse me for the delay in answering you.

[Signed] L. Voronin, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers

Economic Discontent Leads to Mass Meeting in Kiev

90un0214A Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY
In Russian 15 Oct 89 p 1

[V. Fomenko report: "'A Life of Dignity for the Honest Worker'"]

[Text]"The trade unions are holding a meeting? You are confused; it is probably the unregistered groups..."

"I am telling you, our trade unions, the legal ones...."

"It cannot be!"

It can be. If the two old men arguing at the Leninskiy Komsomol Square trolley bus stop had gone into the park, to the silver "Friendship of the Peoples" arch, an unexpected sight would have awaited them. Not only the enormous hollow at the platform but the entire spacious area from the Philharmonic Society to the former summerhouse was filled with people. Thousands of people of Kiev had come here in response to an appeal from the city trade union....

Let us acquaint ourselves first with the slogans and posters that have now become the visiting cards of any mass meeting. The slogan that we put in our headline banner deciphered and refined the dozens of others: "Firm Prices for Consumer Goods!" "No Price Race with Empty Shelves!" "There Are Enough Millionaires!" "Give Us Economic Freedom!"

The essential nature of the demands and the purpose in holding the meeting were revealed in a short opening statement by the chairman of the Kiev city trade union council, L.N. Yakovlev:

"Representatives of the labor collectives have gathered here to support the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions [AUCCTU] statement against price increases and shortages of goods, the distortions in the cooperative movement, and the wage freeze. The trade unions are very concerned about the deterioration in the socioeconomic situation in the country and in the city. They do not agree with the USSR Supreme Soviet decree on questions concerning taxing the wages fund, which will worsen the material position of the labor collectives. Because of this, new difficulties have arisen in the implementation of collective agreements and social programs at enterprises. Many of them will be forced to abandon the provision of additional privileges for women, large families, labor veterans, and low-income workers. This will also cast doubt on the program outlined by the city's trade unions. Moreover, the new taxes will halt output growth and lead to fewer work places and impoverish the consumer market.

"We are worried that the honest labor of workers is no longer a measure of prosperity. We cannot permit the burden of the shortages of goods and price increases to be laid on their shoulders. The cooperative secondhand dealers who are enriching themselves through speculation are aggravating the situation. We are alarmed at the growing violations of law and order and production discipline.

"Because of the critical situation in the consumer market and in transport, the AUCCTU Presidium has sent an open letter to workers in trade, the railroads, and sea and river ports, and the collectives at enterprises and organizations. At a time so difficult for the country the trade union organizations and levels together with the party and the organs of soviet power must become actively involved in work to resolve these burning questions.

"We shall not allow the demagogues to take advantage of the present difficulties to destabilize the situation. We shall do everything possible to defend perestroyka...."

Various people spoke at the meeting. Various problems were raised. Only one thing was common to them all:

Real pain for those who are working honestly but have no opportunity to live like proper human beings.

The author of these lines has been to many meetings, but this one was singular in terms of its organization, cohesion, and unanimity. There was no hooting, no heart-rending cries of "Shame!", no irresponsible appeals. With regard to the symbolism, the banners were merely red, while the red-and-blue ones were merely the foliage of the maples after the blue sky finally broke through the tiresome rain.

True, those present did nevertheless "kill" one of the speakers. And, I think, to no effect. For the chairman of the joint committee of trade unions for the cooperative workers and workers in local industry, N.D. Kozhevina, was defending the right of cooperative workers not to speculate, but to work. She talked about production affairs and said that there was more than enough bureaucracy, but they did not listen to her conclusions. Obviously the people resent the cooperatives and tar everyone with the same brush.

It was pleasing that at the meeting an "atmosphere of the utmost propitiousness" was created for the representatives of the working class. The very first to speak—the brigade leader of a brigade of machinery tuners at the "Mayak" plant, N.V. Kalyuzhnyy (shown in the photograph accompanying the text)—talked at the top of his voice about the role of the labor collectives. Why are they still belittled? Why is it that worker control is still so modest in trade?

"At the Petrovka and Darnitsa stations," he said, "thousands of tons of foodstuffs and industrial goods are piling up in cars waiting to be unloaded. Let us unload them ourselves and distribute them among our own collectives, bypassing the base and trade...."

An unrealistic proposal, of course, but Comrade Kalyuzhnyy's desperation is understandable. As is the deep pain of A.I. Lukovskiy, a driver from the No 13029 Motor Transport Enterprise, for his brother driver who works more and receives less, who poisons himself and others with exhaust gases, who does not even have a heater in his garage, not to mention mechanisms that would makes the repair of vehicles easier.

"A hammer and chisel—that is all science has given our production," the driver said, and appealed bitterly to the trade union leaders: "where are you looking? Whose interests are you defending?"

"There is enough to serve both our interests and yours": This was the demand of V.V. Zhuravlev, an assembly worker at the relay and automatics production association. He worked for more than a month in the FRG, at the Siemens joint-stock company, with which his association had concluded a contract, and he made a thorough study of how the trade unions operate there.

"A worker just like me," said Comrade Zhuravlev, "receives an average of DM3,000 to DM3,200 a month. Whether or not this is a great amount you can judge for yourselves. Our Lada car cost DM3,500 there, and a kilogram of fresh strawberries DM2.5 in February. When I asked the chairman of their trade union committee how they have achieved such a high standard of living, he answered: 'There are no secrets. Everything here is public, and we hold one thing very dear; namely, public opinion. Nevertheless, everything else is not words, but the deeds of a specific boss. The workers themselves are the production chiefs because more than 80 percent of the enterprise stock belongs to them.'"

A blacksmith at the No 3 Housing Construction Combine's reinforced concrete articles plant, V.F. Gutenko, spoke with alarm about the declining prestige of many working occupations. Apart from rural workers, construction workers have the lowest prestige level.

"We value the individual very low and assess his work at a low level. But there can be no construction using the economic method when it takes an electronics engineer 2 years to requalify as a concrete worker, and the housing problem will not be solved."

"Let us join together!" This was the appeal with which the Director of the Ukrainian SSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Hydrology and USSR People's Deputy for trade unions, V.D. Romanenko, ended his speech, echoing other speakers—the Secretary of the Kiev party gorkom, N.N. Sergeyev; the Chairman of the city trade union committee for workers in the State Agroindustrial Committee, V.M. Babich; Sector Chief V.A. Kupnevich from the Ukrainian Scientific Research Institute of Prices, and others.

Of course, not all of the 87 who had requested it got the chance to speak. It was a pity that the meeting was very transient—it lasted only an hour. But the thoughts and proposals of many people were incorporated in the resolution that it was decided to submit to the USSR Supreme Soviet, the AUCCTU, and the deputies of the Kiev City Soviet.

Scientific

Space Module To Link with 'Mir' Station

26 November Launch

LD1611054389 Moscow TASS in English 1743 GMT 15 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 15 TASS—The launch of an equipment module to link up with the Mir orbiting station has been scheduled for November 26 from the Baikonur launch site.

This will be a second attempt to put the module into space. The first launch was aborted by a last minute command of the onboard computer which found a fault in the electronic docking system.

In October, the system, "kurs," was taken off the module and sent to the factory where it had been made, for improvements.

Officials from the USSR Ministry of General Machine Building told TASS that the improved automatic docking stysem, which has withstood a series of trials, "is now ready for operation."

After the first two days of testing, long before the end of the full testing cycle, experts concluded that the system was in order.

The module is now being prepared for launch in accordance with the pre-launch schedule.

By November 17, the module's propulsion system will be loaded with fuel components. Then it will be attached to a proton booster rocket and taken to the launch pad on November 21.

Before November 25, the work with the module and the booster rocket will continue on the pad, and the rocket will be fuelled.

Further Details

LD1611072189 Moscow TASS in English 0711 GMT 16 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 16 TASS—A module to re-equip the Mir space station is scheduled to blast off on November 26, officials of the Chief Administration for the Development and Use of Space Engineering for the Economy and Research told TASS.

A proton booster rocket will put the module into orbit in 10 days' time and then it will dock with the Soviet long-time space complex.

The re-equipment module has an air lock chamber for space walkouts and other equipment for work in outer space, including a "space bike" for a cosmonaut's independent movements.

Designers baptised the "bike" "icarus". It has a fly-away umbilical cord, although an independent power supply system enables the "bike" to move in space without it.

The module also has equipment to retool the complex as well as fuel, water and food.

Cosmonauts Aleskandr Viktorenko and Aleksandr Serebrov who are working for the third month aboard the Mir station, are waiting for the module. It will considerably expand the range of research.

As it was reported earlier, some changes have taken place in the programme of the current mission aboard the Mir station. The re-equipment module was to be launched in mid-September.

However, the launching was put off, since some malfunctions in the Kurs system were detected during ground tests. The Kurs system will put the module into a pre-set orbit and ensure its rendezvous with the station.

U.S. To Launch Satellites With Soviet Rockets

LD1611111689 Moscow TASS in English 0957 GMT 16 Nov 89

[Text] New York November 16 TASS—By TASS correspondent Yuriy Kirilchenko:

The first agreement on launching American satellites with Soviet rockets was concluded between the Space Commerce Corporation based in Houston, Texas, and the Soviet Chief Administration for the Development and Use of Space Engineering for the Economy and Research.

Under a contract worth 54 million dollars, Soviet booster rockets will put into orbit eight satellites of the Energetics Satellite Corporation based in Colorado.

The corporation plans to set up a world-wide satellite system to control freight traffic. The first launching will be made from the Baikonur Cosmodrome late next year.

According to Space Commerce President Arth Dula, who announced the deal, his corporation will tender an application for export licences in the near future.

He noted that cooperation with the USSR in civil space programmes gives U.S. companies a chance to place space equipment into orbit more quickly.

However, there is still a large hurdle blocking the way of implementation of the Soviet-American programme for peaceful uses of space. The concluded agreement has to be approved by Washington.

According to the present American laws on control over the export of modern technology, it is forbidden for U.S. satellites to be placed into orbit from the Soviet territory.

Moscow Radio Advertises Satellite Photos

LD0911203689 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1630 GMT 9 Nov 89

["Advertisement"]

[Text] The main center for the reception and processing of satellite information and the regional computing center of the USSR State Committee for Hydrometeorology are offering photographic materials of the surface of the mainland and oceans of our planet gained with the aid of radiophysical and scanning apparatus mounted on board artificial satellites of the Resurs system and of the Okean type.

Satellite information is destined for use in resolving the most varied national economic tasks and in scientific research on the study of natural resources. Photographs from space represent a unique opportunity for constant monitoring of the ecological situation in any region of the earth and to operationally monitor spring and tundra

fires and rivers and reservoirs prone to flooding after rainfall; to determine the condition of agricultural land and the appraisal of the seasonal development of crops; to help fishermen search for catching areas; and for new opportunities in geology and hydrology.

Space photographs will help solve many problems from the most unexpected angles. You can receive information in the form of black and white photoprints, negatives, or in the form of recordings on magnetic tape. The information is processed with the aid of the newest software. By using satellite information you will gain an irreplaceable assistant in your work. Address all questions to the main center for the reception and processing of satellite information at the number 483-41-18 or 483-42-82. I repeat 483-41- 18 or 483-42-82. Satellite information at your service.

New TV Satellite Station Opens in Semipalatinsk

LD1311115789 Alma Ata Domestic Service in Kazakh 0200 GMT 9 Nov 89

[Summary] A satellite relay station has gone into operation at Arkat village in Semipalatinsk Oblast, enabling residents to receive Central as well as republican and local TV programs. At the present time, two thirds of villages and rayons of the Semipalatinsk Oblast have been provided with good reception.

Military

Press Conference Details Sale of Ex-Army Hardware

PM1311151189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Nov 89 Second Edition p 2

[N. Sautin article under the "Military Policy" rubric: "Missiles Under the Hammer"]

[Text] By decision of the Soviet Government, the first exhibition-cum-sale "Military Hardware for Peaceful Purposes" opens in late November in Moscow's "Sokolniki" Park. Components from the intermediate-range missiles that are being eliminated will be auctioned off. The buyers will be not only industrial enterprises and cooperatives but also private individuals and foreign businessmen.

"What, the West too?!"—a correspondent from a central newspaper exclaimed. Yes, Defense Ministry representatives—Major General B. Surikov, an expert in new arms, and Colonel G. Rodionov, head of the exhibition management—confirmed. NATO countries will also be able to obtain any exhibits that take their fancy. Of course, the "goods" themselves, which are being totally eliminated under the treaty, cannot be exhibited. But both Soviet and foreign clients will be able to obtain at auction components, mechanisms, and missile equipment modules which do not constitute a defense secret today.

What exhibits will we see at "Sokolniki"? Electrotechnical equipment, of course: Stabilized current units, power supply modules with distributors, voltage stabilizers, automation and guidance modules....

For instance, there are various options for using the MAZ-547V chassis, which is capable of transporting loads of up to 60 tonnes along any roads and fording deep rivers. This very powerful vehicle was used to transport intermediate-range missiles. A "home" based on a MAZ-543 with enhanced off-road capability was also developed for the missilemen. Of its eight compartments four are equipped as cabins.

A considerable proportion of the profit obtained from the sale of the military hardware will be used to meet servicemen's social and everyday needs and also those of officers and ensigns discharged from the USSR Armed Forces in accordance with the unilateral reductions.

The exhibition is an experiment. Its experience will be used in organizing subsequent exhibition-sales of military hardware, which will, I believe, become more necessary after the expected signing of the treaty on a 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive arms and the limitation of conventional arms in Europe.

At a press conference yesterday in the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center journalists received certain data on questions of the conversion of defense industry. Which sectors of the country's economy will be assisted by conversion? The agro-industrial complex, light industry, trade, public catering, and the production of consumer goods and medical equipment. Of course, the program to provide the country with information technology also needs support: The development of electronics, computers, and communications systems. The production of new, more economical and comfortable new-generation aircraft—the Il-96-300, the Tu-204, the Il-114, and others—will be assimilated. Construction of the civil and fishing maritime fleets will increase.

The State Program for the Conversion of the Defense Industry in 1991-1995, which will be submitted for consideration by the USSR Supreme Soviet by the end of the year, will determine the specific allocation of the defense industry capacities that are being released. The USSR Council of Ministers State Commission on Military-Industrial Questions, the USSR State Planning Committee, the Defense Ministry, and defense industry ministries are engaged in elaborating it.

Two programs for 1989-1995 are already being implemented. One concerns production of highly efficient technological equipment for the processing industry. The defense ministries' complex is to create 3,000 types of new equipment. Precisely 345 plants and 205 leading research and design organizations are involved in this work.

Manufacture of new consumer goods constitutes another program. It is planned to produce more than 140 types of complex domestic equipment, including televisions with

stereo sound, food processors, iceboxes, vacuum cleaners, and also compact disk players, video players, videocameras, and personal computers that were not previously produced in our country.

The scale of the economic return from disarmament depends on the effectiveness of conversion. According to Soviet economists' estimates, the action that has already been taken will make it possible to increase the country's national income by a minimum of R1.8 billion, and the overall economic effect from the reductions in defense spending and in the size of the armed forces and from the discharged servicemen's involvement in social production will total approximately R12 billion.

Gorbachev Signs Decree for Military Promotions

LD1411214889 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1647 GMT 14 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow, 14 Nov (TASS)—The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has conferred the military rank of Army General on Colonel General Makhmut Gareyev. Admiral Konstantin Makarov has been promoted to Admiral of the Fleet. The Presidium's decree was signed in the Kremlin today by Mikhail Gorbachev.